

# THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



## ADVISORY BOARD :

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. M. Ginsberg. Prof. C. Singer.  
Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

## EDITORIAL BOARD :

Rabbi A. Altmann, Ph.D. D. Diringer, D.Litt. A. M. Hyamson, O.B.E.  
E. Marmorstein, M.A. Rabbi I. I. Mattuck, D.H.L. C. Rabin, D.Phil.  
S. Stein, Ph.D.

## EDITOR :

J. L. TEICHER, M.A., Ph.D.

Vol. IV. No. 2

1953

## CONTENTS

	Page
IN MEMORIAM—HERBERT DANBY . . . . .	47
J. L. TEICHER	
THE TEACHING OF THE PRE-PAULINE CHURCH IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS—IV . . . . .	49
L. JACOBS	
THE TALMUDIC HERMENEUTICAL RULE OF 'BINYAN 'ABH' AND J. S. MILL'S 'METHOD OF AGREEMENT' . . . . .	59
N. WIEDER	
THE OLD PALESTINIAN RITUAL—NEW SOURCES . . . . .	65
S. D. GOITEIN	
'OBADYAH, A NORMAN PROSELYTE . . . . .	74
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	
SOLOMON ZEITLIN: 1. A REPLY TO A REVIEWER . . . . .	85
S. A. ROCHLIN: 2. ABU NADDARA, AN EGYPTIAN JEWISH NATIONALIST . . . . .	90
S. D. GOITEIN: 3. CORRECTIONS TO <i>JJS</i> . VOL. III. No. 4 . . . . .	91
C. RABIN	
CURRENT LITERATURE . . . . .	92

Printed and Published by Jewish Chronicle Publications,  
37, Furnival Street, London, E.C.4.

## IN MEMORIAM

---

### HERBERT DANBY

The Rev. Dr. Herbert Danby, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford and Canon of Christ Church, died on March 29 at Oxford at the age of 64. Hebrew scholarship has lost in him an outstanding protagonist who unobtrusively but efficiently directed the study of Hebrew into a new path, and the "Journal of Jewish Studies" has been bereaved of a staunch and wise friend who served on its Advisory Board and never spared himself in giving guidance and encouragement.

Herbert Danby was born in Leeds on January 20, 1889. His whole career seems in retrospect to exhibit a predetermined pattern leading up to the formation of a versatile and original Hebrew scholar. Endowed with a great gift for music, he at first appeared destined, after his election in 1907 as the Holroyd musical scholar of Keble College, Oxford, to gain distinction as a composer. But religion and in particular one of its important aspects, the relationship of Judaism and Christianity, soon became his absorbing passion. Danby prepared himself with characteristic thoroughness for his task of understanding this problem. He studied theology, Hebrew, and other Semitic languages, with brilliant results. He gained in 1910 the Hall-Houghton Junior Septuagint Prize, then the Pusey and Ellerton Hebrew Scholarship and, finally, in 1912, first class in the Honours School of Oriental languages and literature at Oxford. The study of theology which he pursued at the same time led in 1913 to his ordination and his appointment as curate of Waddesdon in Buckinghamshire.

The second phase of Danby's life began with his appointment as Sub-Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, at the end of 1913. The six years which he spent in this office greatly widened his intellectual horizon and gave him an opportunity to pursue the study of Hebrew (biblical and post-biblical) and of Syriac. Within the first two years of his appointment, he gathered the fruits of his labour by winning the Syriac Prize and the Senior Kennicott Scholarship at Oxford.

The third phase of Danby's life opened with his appointment as Librarian of St. George's Cathedral in Jerusalem, which was followed by that of residential canon of the Cathedral. It was in some sense an enlargement and intensification of the Hawarden phase, enhanced in addition by the exciting atmosphere of life in Palestine under the Mandate. The spectacle of the renaissance of modern



Hebrew culture and of the transformation of the traditional political pattern in the Near East exercised a powerful stimulus on Danby's mind and aroused his vital interests. Danby satisfied these interests again in his characteristically thorough fashion; he gained complete command of modern Hebrew and such knowledge of the political situation as enabled him to fulfil the exacting task of the "Times" Correspondent for Palestine and Transjordan.

The versatility of Danby's mind, his native wisdom and the wealth of his experience determined his attitude to Hebrew scholarship. Herbert Danby broke away from the usual rut of Hebrew studies, and became a modern Hebrew scholar in the true sense. He recognised that scholarship is history, aiming at the understanding of all the dynamic phases of development of a civilisation. In his total approach to the study of Hebrew, he felt that the isolation of single phases in the development of Hebrew civilisation is an artificial abstraction which creates pseudo-problems and leads to speculation, not knowledge. His entire scholarly work seems to have been inspired by his perception of the true meaning of history. He set before himself accordingly a double task: to fill the gaps in the general knowledge of Hebrew civilisation by translating its significant monuments, and to show in concrete examples the correct treatment of a scholarly problem. Thus during his Palestinian phase, Danby gave us on the one hand his masterly translation of the *Mishna* and of J. Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth* and *A History of Modern Hebrew Literature*, and on the other hand his series of lectures under the title *The Jew and Christianity*, in which he considered the subject in its most significant historical phases, from the beginning to recent times.

The last phase of Danby's life, beginning with his appointment in 1936 to the Chair of Hebrew at Oxford, saw a continuation and expansion of his modern methods of Hebrew scholarship. He gave us further masterly translations of Bialik's *Biblical Legends* (from modern Hebrew) and of a section of Maimonides' Code, *The Book of Offerings* (from medieval Hebrew), and published with Segal an *English and Modern Hebrew Dictionary*—as if to impress upon the public the notion of the continuity of Hebrew. And again in his essay *The Old Testament in The Study of Theology* he gave another example of a truly historical treatment of a subject by showing that the "truth" of the Bible is not something static, but a continual process of discovery by man in the course of his civilisation. This scholarly attitude led to his reorganisation of Hebrew studies at Oxford and his deep interest in Hebrew scholars and scholarly enterprise.

Herbert Danby, the modest, wise, human teacher and friend through his writings, teaching and personal relations, has sown the seeds of the modern approach to Hebrew studies which will bear fruit in this country and elsewhere.

# THE TEACHING OF THE PRE-PAULINE CHURCH IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS—IV

(Continued from Vol. IV, No. 1)

The purpose of this section is to show that the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Damascus Fragments contain teaching concerning Jesus which coincides with that of the pre-Pauline Church and the Jewish-Christian sect, the Ebionites. The study will be based on an extensive inquiry into the sources and will have as its starting-point an attempt to analyse and elucidate the homily contained in the opening pages of the Damascus Fragments, beginning with a translation of the text (pages 1-2):

Now, all who know what righteousness is, hear and understand<sup>1</sup> how God acts, how He condemns all flesh and executes judgment upon all who despise Him. Thus, because Israel sinned, forsaking God, He hid His face from Israel and from His sanctuary and gave them over to the sword. But, remembering the covenant with the patriarchs,<sup>2</sup> He allowed a remnant of Israel to survive and did not consign them to complete destruction.

And at the end of the period of "Wrath," three hundred and ninety years after He had delivered them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, He brought to them salvation,<sup>3</sup> causing to blossom, from Israel and Aaron, the root of an eternal plant,<sup>4</sup> that it might take possession of His country and fatten with grace His earth.<sup>5</sup> And the people perceived that they were sinners and knew that they were guilty men; but for twenty years they were like blind men groping after the [right] way.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> שמעו, רבונו. Cpr. for the form of address, Mat. xv, 10: "Hear and understand."

<sup>2</sup> ברית ראשונים

<sup>3</sup> פקדם. Cpr. Ps. cvi, 4: פקדתי בישועתך. The relation of this psalm to the text of the Damascus Fragments will be discussed later in this study.

<sup>4</sup> Line 7; read ממשעת עולם as in the Discipline Scroll, viii, 5; xi, 8. "Eternal" has here the double meaning of "established from all eternity" and "lasting for ever." An idea related to that of the Damascus Fragments is expressed (negatively) in Mat. xv, 13: "Every plant (*futeia*), which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." The Hebrew ממשעת is the exact equivalent of the Greek *futeia*—as has been pointed out by W. K. M. Grossouw (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament in Studia Catholica*, 1952, p. 7). The "blossoming of the root of the eternal plant" refers to Jesus' birth.

<sup>5</sup> These are figures of speech referring to the blessings bestowed by the saviour, the scion of Aaron and Israel, i.e., Jesus; (see *JJS*, II (1951), p. 134ff.). For the expression לרשן בשר in the Fragments, cpr. Pr. xv, 30: שמיעה טובה חרשן עצם ("Good tidings make the bones fat"). It is very likely that the expression in the Fragments is intended to recall *euangelion*—"good tidings"—the Gospel. The language of the Damascus Fragments, like that of the Dead Sea Scrolls, is highly allusive.

<sup>6</sup> The period of twenty years characterised by consciousness of sin and lack of knowledge of the means of salvation is a clear allusion to the ministry of John the Baptist. I shall discuss presently the relevance of the dates mentioned in this passage of the Fragments.



Then God understood their actions—that they were seeking Him with a whole heart—and He raised up for them<sup>1</sup> the True Teacher (מורה הצדק) to guide their feet into the way of His mind<sup>2</sup> and He made known the judgment that will be enacted at the Last Day,<sup>3</sup> that is, that kind of punishment which He had meted out<sup>4</sup> to the recent generation, the treacherous congregation who had gone astray from the [right] path.<sup>5</sup>

This was at the juncture<sup>6</sup> foretold by Scripture in the words, “like a rebellious heifer, so Israel rebelled,”<sup>7</sup> when the Man of Scoffing [Paul] arose, who preached false doctrines to Israel and led them astray into the pathless wilderness—to “level ancient heights,” to depart from the paths of justice and to “pull out the boundary signs set up in their property by their forebears”—for the purpose of fastening upon them the curses of God’s covenant<sup>8</sup> and of delivering them to the sword that wreaks vengeance for the broken covenant.<sup>9</sup>

Because they taught glibly<sup>10</sup> and chose to mock,<sup>10</sup> watched for opportunities of intemperance<sup>11</sup> and indulged in incontinent desires,<sup>12</sup> justified the wicked and wronged the just, transgressed the covenant and annulled the law, gathered together to plot against the life of the righteous, abhorred all who walked in righteousness, pursued them until death<sup>13</sup> and rejoiced in the strife of the people—because of all these things God’s wrath was kindled against their congregation; for they made all their possessions and actions “unclean” in His sight.<sup>14</sup>

Before proceeding to define the main idea underlying this text, it is necessary to deal with the chronological references explicitly

<sup>1</sup> ויקם להם, This phrase is characteristically significant: it is used in Deut. xviii, 18: ויקם ה' להם מושיע (I shall raise them up a Prophet) and Jud. iii, 15: ויקם ה' להם מושיע (the Lord raised them up a deliverer). The former text is applied to Jesus in Acts iii, 22 and vii, 37.

<sup>2</sup> The function of the True Teacher is thus to instruct men concerning God’s mind. This is exactly the function ascribed by Paul to Jesus: “For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.” (I Cor. ii, 16.)

<sup>3</sup> Line 12: לדורות אחרונים “concerning the last generations of men.” This is clearly a reference to the Last Judgment.

<sup>4</sup> Line 12: עשה ב in the sense of “punish.” Cpr. Jos. xxiv, 5. The meaning of the involved sentence is that God revealed, when the True Teacher appeared, the fate [*i.e.*, the punishment] of sinners at the Last Judgment, the kind of fate which had recently befallen the treacherous congregation.

<sup>5</sup> This refers to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 c.e., in which members of the Church, followers of Paul, perished. See *JJS*, II (1951), pp. 122, 126ff., 141.

<sup>6</sup> Line 13: היא העת, This refers to בור אחרון in the preceding line and determines its meaning.

<sup>7</sup> נפדה סוריה כ סור ישראל: Hos. iv, 16. The biblical passage agrees with Targum and Peshitta, not with MT. See M. H. GOTTSTEIN, *Vetus Testamentum*, III (1953), p. 82.

<sup>8</sup> For notes on this passage, see *JJS*, II (1951), p. 117.

<sup>9</sup> Lev. xxvi, 25.

<sup>10</sup> Cpr. Is. xxx, 10.

<sup>11</sup> ויצפ לפרצות; cpr. Ps. xxvii, 32: ציפה רשע לצדיק. The phrase is a metaphor for “lead a dissolute life.”

<sup>12</sup> ויבחרו בשבט הציור; cpr. Hos. x, 11. The phrase is used in a metaphorical sense. Cpr. GINZBERG, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte in MGWJ*, 1911, p. 673.

<sup>13</sup> וירדשם לחרב; cpr. Jer. xxv, 31: ונתנם לחרב.

<sup>14</sup> For notes on and emendations of this passage, see *JJS*, II (1951), p. 117

mentioned in it. The reference to the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar is clear and unambiguous, but what is the significance of the two dates, "the period of 'Wrath' of three hundred and ninety years" and "the period of twenty years" after that event? This question, perhaps more than any other, has bedevilled the investigation of the Damascus Fragments, and the great variety of answers offered shows more clearly than any other single instance the lack of a proper historical method in the field of Hebrew studies. Symptomatic in this respect is Professor Rowley's recent discussion of this question. In regard to the first figure of three hundred and ninety years, Professor Rowley assumes that the author of the Damascus Fragments derived this figure from the "three hundred and ninety days" mentioned in Ezek. iv, 5; and concludes: "If, then, he [the author of the Fragments] was schematically reinterpreting a figure which he had found in the book of Ezekiel, we ought not to rely on this for accurate chronology, and though I think it was in this case a close approximation to fact, we should rely on other considerations and not on this 'to establish it.'"<sup>1</sup>

Again, in regard to the figure of twenty years in the Fragments, Professor Rowley writes: "The next period of twenty years, the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, was much nearer the writer's time, and may be expected to give a close approximation to the truth. This is not schematic in the same sense, though it is a round figure, rather than a precise one. But so far as we know, it was not based on any older text which it interpreted."<sup>2</sup>

Despite the cautious and non-committal wording of his statements, Professor Rowley clearly considers the figures in the Fragments a close approximation to "fact" or "the truth," and adopts them as the proper starting point for historical investigation of the Fragments. He writes: "Without relying on the precision of the chronology, we may ask whether the period in the early part of the second century B.C.E. would provide a suitable background for the things we read in our texts."<sup>3</sup>

Professor Rowley seems to me, with all due respect, in this instance to be wanting to eat his cake and have it. The figures in the Fragments, he tells us, cannot be relied upon for accurate chronology, but ought nevertheless to be relied upon for closely approximate chronology. Why?

However, as if to compensate us for his oscillation in this matter, Professor Rowley offers us a precise and fixed date concerning another detail referred to in the Fragments. He writes: "The length of the career of the Teacher of Righteousness is not specified. After he was 'gathered in' a further period of forty years was expected before the advent of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel."<sup>4</sup> It would

<sup>1</sup> *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford, 1952, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*



indeed be of great importance for the interpretation of the Fragments to know that the advent of the Messiah was to occur forty years after the death of the Teacher, but, unfortunately, there is not the slightest hint of this in the text of the Fragments. On pp. 19-20, lines 35-1, we read: "From the day of the gathering in of the Only Teacher until the advent of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel"<sup>1</sup>; and on p. 20, lines 13-15, we read: "And from the day of the gathering in of the Only Teacher until the men of war were destroyed, who had joined the Man of Lies, about forty years elapsed."<sup>2</sup> It is obvious that Professor Rowley has conflated these two passages, which have nothing to do with each other, and "produced" a new date. Such production of new dates and data is, alas, not an uncommon feature in Hebrew "historical" research.

A rigorous application of the historical method combined with a moderate use of common sense suffices to clear up the matter of the two figures in the Damascus Fragments. There are, in fact, only two possibilities. The figures of "three hundred and ninety" and "twenty" years are either historical (from our point of view or from that of the author) or symbolical. (I prefer the latter term to "schematic," which is ambiguous.) The choice between the two possibilities will depend in the first place on whether the text of the Fragments contains a clear and unambiguous reference to an historical event which provides us with an accurate date, and secondly, on whether the author of the Fragments indicates clearly that he regards his figures as symbolical. If the text of the Fragments contains a reference to a precise historical event, and if there is a clear indication that the figures mentioned in the Fragments are to be regarded as symbols, the problem of the chronology of the Fragments will have been solved. The date of any such historical event will have to be accepted and the figures rejected as symbols of no historical value whatever. The question, whether or not we are able satisfactorily to interpret the symbolical significance of these figures, is irrelevant to the basic problem of the chronology of the Fragments, although we should make an attempt to explain these arithmetical symbols for the sake of a proper and complete understanding of the text.

Now, in my paper "The Damascus Fragments and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect,"<sup>3</sup> I have shown that the Fragments contain precise and unmistakable references to the historical event of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E.,<sup>4</sup> as well as to the fate of the Christian Church in the City, references which constitute

<sup>1</sup> מיום דאסף מורה היחיד עד עמוד משיח מאהרן ומישראל

<sup>2</sup> מיום דאסף [מורה] היחיד עד חס כל אנשי המלחמה אשר הלכו עם איש הכוזב כשנים ארבעים

The period of about forty years referred to in this passage is historically exact, since about forty years elapsed between Jesus' death and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. See *JJS*, II (1951), p. 123f.

<sup>3</sup> *JJS*, II (1951), pp. 115-143.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.



“irrefutable evidence of the Christian origin of the Fragments and the kindred Scrolls.”<sup>1</sup> It is symptomatic of the prevailing trend in Hebrew studies that, although there was some reaction among scholars to my interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the evidence that I have brought forward to fix the date of the Damascus Fragments has not been discussed. It has been “ignored,” as if from fear that speculation and controversy might otherwise cease.<sup>2</sup> Professor Rowley has gone a step further. He writes: “It is not easy to see how the chronological data of the *Zadokite Work* could be interpreted on this theory [*i.e.*, my theory of the Ebionite origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls], and no effort is made to interpret them.”<sup>3</sup> Surely, a whole paper devoted to establishing the chronological data of the *Zadokite Work* or Damascus Fragments can hardly be described as “no effort” (whether successful or not)!<sup>4</sup>

The precise reference to an historical event (the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E.) fulfils the first condition that determines the rejection of the figures mentioned in the Fragments. What of the second condition? Does the author indicate clearly that he regards his figures as symbolical? He could not, I submit, be more explicit, at least in regard to one of these figures. He refers to the three hundred and ninety years as “the period of ‘Wrath’”; that is to say, this number of years is for him a symbol of the period of time during which Israel was under God’s wrath. This figure thus has no chronological value and we must accept as the only established point of reference for dating the composition of the Damascus Fragments the year 70 C.E., the date of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

I shall now attempt to discover the origin and explain the significance of the numbers of years, “three hundred and ninety” and “twenty,” mentioned in the Fragments, in order to dispose of a problem which has caused so much erroneous speculation and prevented a proper understanding of the meaning of the Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

# 1. THE ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SYMBOLICAL NUMBERS IN THE DAMASCUS FRAGMENTS

The characteristic feature of the “chronology” of the Damascus Fragments is that it is based on the notion of an “historical period” lasting for four hundred and ten years and subdivided into two

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 123-124.

<sup>2</sup> It is equally symptomatic that the evidence of the Christian marginal signs in the Isaiah Scroll [see my note *Material Evidence of the Christian Origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls in JJS, III* (1952), pp. 128-132] has also been “ignored” by Hebrew scholars.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>4</sup> It would seem, indeed, from Professor ROWLEY’S remark that he has not read my paper. But, on the other hand, he gives the gist of it on p. 54, note 3, of his *Zadokite Fragments*. The ways of modern Hebrew scholarship are inscrutable!





four hundred and ten years, that of the Second Temple four hundred and twenty years—neither of these figures being historically correct. The figure of four hundred and ten years in the Damascus Fragments subdivided into twenty and three hundred and ninety years, seems to be somehow related to the rabbinical figures. The exact determination of this relation is an important task but tangential to our main purpose. We must limit ourselves to the attempt to discover the origin of the symbolic figures in the Damascus Fragments, and if we succeed in this task we may gain something to help us in the other task also.

Let us begin with the figure of "three hundred and ninety years" in the Damascus Fragments. It has long been recognised by scholars that this figure is related to the three hundred and ninety days of Ezekiel iv, 5. But related exactly in what way?

In order to reply to this question let us turn to Ezekiel iv, 1-13 and read the text as it stands, discarding the microscope of the Bible critic. The prophet, who is addressed by God as the "Son of Man," is enjoined to perform a kind of pantomime. He has to lie in bonds on his left side for three hundred and ninety days and sustain himself on a special diet. (Then he has to turn on his right side and lie for another forty days, but, apparently, without bonds or the diet.) In this position he has to point with his uncovered arm to an iron screen bearing the inscription: "This is the symbol of the house of Israel."<sup>1</sup> Behind the screen a tile was placed on which the prophet had previously drawn a pictorial representation of the siege of Jerusalem.

The meaning of this pantomime is given clearly in the text itself, indicated by the prophet's pointing to the inscription on the screen. Those who wanted to find out the meaning had only to look behind the screen and see the drawing of Jerusalem besieged. The prophet, or rather the "Son of Man," is the mime who personifies Jerusalem. He is in bonds, just as the City is under siege; and he lies for three hundred and ninety days on his left side—the period of duration of the siege. This is clearly indicated in verse 8: "And, behold, I will lay bonds upon thee and thou shalt not turn thee from one side to another, till thou hast ended the day of thy siege."

But this is not all; some features of the pantomime performed by the "Son of Man" have in addition a symbolical significance. The figure of three hundred and ninety days, during which the "Son of Man" lies in bonds, signifies three hundred and ninety years during which Israel will be in the bonds of sin. And the special diet signifies the contamination of the people as the result of their dispersion among the Gentiles during this period. The symbolical significance of these features amounts, therefore, to the prophecy or prediction that after Nebuchadnezzar's victory the people of

<sup>1</sup> Verse 3: וצרת עליה אות הוא לבית ישראל

Israel will live for three hundred and ninety years under the domination of sin and, consequently, under God's wrath and punishment, which will be manifested in the dispersion of the people among the Gentiles.

The author of the Damascus Fragments read his Ezekiel as the text stands, and took the prophecy concerning the duration of Israel's sin and punishment to mean what it says. He accordingly states that the period of God's wrath lasted for three hundred and ninety years from the time when Israel was "delivered into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar." In short, he adopted the symbolical chronology of Ezekiel as historical chronology.

Let us turn now to the second symbolical figure of "twenty years." In order to understand the origin of this figure it is necessary to consider two sets of ideas. The first was again inspired by Ezekiel. It will be remembered that the "Son of Man" personifies as the mime the fate of Jerusalem, and that he personifies at the same time symbolically the fate of Israel after the destruction of the City. The underlying idea here is that history is personified by human life, or, that the life of man is an allegory of history.

The second set of ideas is of rabbinic origin. According to the rabbis, man in the first twenty years of his life is exempt from the punishment of death inflicted by God, כרת for sins committed. In the Palestinian Talmud, for example, the passage, Ps. xc, 10: "The days of our years are three score years and ten," is quoted and followed by the statement: "Deduct from these twenty years during which the celestial court inflicts no punishment of death."<sup>1</sup> Still more interesting is the statement in Bereshith Rabba 58: "Sarah at the age of one hundred, was like a girl of twenty years in regard to sin."<sup>2</sup> During the first twenty years of his life, man is thus freed from the punishment of *kareth*; he is, so to say, a "minor" from the moral point of view. The rabbinical idea of "moral minority" offers, in my opinion, the best commentary on Paul's statement in Rom. vii, 9: "For I was alive without the Law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died." That is to say, Paul declares that, until he reached the age of twenty, he lived under exemption from the divine punishment of death, *kareth*, but became liable to it afterwards. The association of ideas of "law," "sin," and "death" in Paul's thought—a point of perplexing difficulty—receives illumination when referred to the rabbinic idea of the punishment of death, *kareth*, for sin, particularly when we remember that "death" in this connection is spiritual as well as corporal.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Bikurim*, II, 64c. י"י שנותינו בהם שבעים שנה צא מהן עשרים שנה שאין בית דין של מעלה עונשין וכורתין in *MGWJ*, 1912 p. 300. Cpr. also *Sanhed.* xi, 30b. See on this matter GINZBERG.

<sup>2</sup> [שרה] בת ק' שנה כבת כ"י לחמא

<sup>3</sup> See *Sanhed.* 64b (and 99a).



Now, the combination of the two sets of ideas, the "personification of history" and the period of "moral minority," necessarily results in the view that in a given period of history (which is conceived of in terms of man's life) there is a subdivision, corresponding to the "minority" of twenty years. Hence, the author of the rabbinic statement in *Seder Eliyahu Rabba*, referred to above, naturally assumes that "twenty years" must be deducted from the total number of years of the period of the First Temple, that is to say, from four hundred and ten years. The expression "deduct," used by him, clearly indicates the origin of his idea; for it is the same expression that is used in the statement in the Palestinian Talmud that twenty years must be deducted from man's life during which he is exempt from the punishment of death for sins committed. The figure of twenty years thus becomes a symbol for a period of history, or rather for a subdivision of a period, that is free from sin.

Or, to express the same thought in different words: if we accept the symbolic chronology in history and assume that a given period of history lasted "three hundred and ninety years," that is to say, that it was a "period of sin and of God's wrath," we must add to it another "twenty years," corresponding to the period that was "free from sin." This is precisely what the author of the *Damascus Fragments* did; he added "twenty years" of repentance to the period of "three hundred and ninety years" of God's wrath.

To sum up: the symbolic chronology is based on the conception of "personified history." Just as in man's life we must distinguish the "age of minority" from the "age of maturity," so must we subdivide any given period of history into its two sections. The author of the *Damascus Fragments* derived from *Ezekiel* both the idea of "personified history" and the symbolic chronology of the three hundred and ninety years of God's wrath, adopting also the rabbinical idea of a "moral minority" of twenty years in order to signify a period of history that was free from sin. The latter idea suited his purpose admirably for it enabled him to refer in this manner to the period of repentance characterised by the activity of John the Baptist.

\* \* \* \*

The above explanation of the origin and significance of the figures used by the author of the *Damascus Fragments* removes a stumbling block from the path of our inquiry. We are free now from the mesmerising power that these figures have exercised on the mind of so many scholars, and are able to turn our attention to the most important feature of the historical pattern that underlies the homily on page 1 of the *Fragments*. This pattern which, it is scarcely

surprising, has so far escaped the notice of scholars, is very simple. Until the rise of the True Teacher, Israel, throughout the whole period of her history, lived in a state of sin and under God's wrath. The First Temple was destroyed and the people given over to the sword, with the exception of a "remnant," because Israel had sinned and forsaken God ; and after the destruction of the Temple, Israel still continued to sin and was the object of God's wrath and punishment. Only with the rise of the True Teacher, who brought salvation, did the secular dominion of sin and of God's wrath come to end. Who then is the True Teacher, *מורה הצדק*, who determined this momentous "crisis" in history ?

*(To be continued)*

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.



# THE TALMUDIC HERMENEUTICAL RULE OF 'BINYAN 'ABH' AND J. S. MILL'S 'METHOD OF AGREEMENT'

The idea of the influence of Aristotelian logic on the talmudic hermeneutic principles (*middoth*), via Shemaiah and Abtalion, the teachers of Hillel, was first advanced as an hypothesis by Adolf Jellinek in the last century and has since won wide acceptance.<sup>1</sup> Adolf Schwarz in particular has noted the analogy between such logical methods as the use of the syllogism and the *qal wa-homer*.<sup>2</sup>

In the nature of things there can have been little correspondence in the talmudic literature with modern inductive logic. Schwarz, in his work on the principle of *binyan 'abh*,<sup>3</sup> remarks on this<sup>4</sup> and seeks to explain this principle as a form of analogy: to use his own terminology, as a type of either "Species Induction Reference" or "Genus Induction Reference."<sup>5</sup> It will be suggested here that a more fruitful way of explaining the principle is to compare it with John Stuart Mill's method of agreement,<sup>6</sup> to which it bears a striking resemblance. The rabbis, in their attempt to discover general principles behind the laws of the Torah, used, apparently, a method similar in form to that classified by Mill as a means of discovering the laws of nature.

The Mishnah in tractate Qiddushin<sup>7</sup> rules that a woman can be acquired in marriage in three ways: by the payment of money, *kese*, by the delivery into her hands of a bond, *sheṭar*, and by cohabitation, *bi'ah*. In Amoraic times, the Mishnah was interpreted to mean that any one of the three ways suffices to bring about a

<sup>1</sup> See I. H. WEISS, *Dor Dor Wedoreshaw*, 2nd ed., 1924, vol. I, p. 164, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See his *Der Hermeneutische Syllogismus in der Talmudischen Litteratur*, Vienna, 1901. Comp. the same author's *Die Hermeneutische Antinomie in der Talmudischen Litteratur*, Vienna, 1913, and his *Die Hermeneutische Quantitätsrelation in der Talmudischen Litteratur*, Vienna, 1916. In fact, there is hardly an analogy between the *qal-wahomer* and the Aristotelian syllogism.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Hermeneutische Induktion in der Talmudischen Litteratur*, Vienna, 1909. Cf. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Berlin, 1929, vol. VII, p. 1190, and *Ensyqlopedia Talmudith*, vol. IV, Jer., 1952, pp. 2-11.

<sup>4</sup> *Die Hermeneut. Induk.*, p. 158: "Induktionsschlüsse in diesem Sinne [der erkenntnistheoretischen Logik] hat weder das Altertum noch das Mittelalter gekannt; es ist darum selbstverständlich, das die hermeneutische Induktion in der talmudischen Litteratur, welche den Inhalt dieser Arbeit bildet, nicht durch die erkenntnistheoretische, sondern nur durch die Aristotelische Logik beleuchtet werden kann" (italics mine). (Inductive judgments in this sense [i.e., in accordance with the logic of theory of knowledge] were known neither in antiquity nor in the middle ages; it is obvious, therefore, that the hermeneutical induction in talmudic literature, the subject of the present work, cannot be explained by the logic of theory of knowledge but only by the Aristotelian logic.)

<sup>5</sup> *Hermen. Induktion*, p. 170f. and p. 228f.

<sup>6</sup> JOHN STUART MILL, *A System of Logic*, Bk. III, chapters viii and ix.

<sup>7</sup> I, 1.

valid marriage. The Gemara<sup>1</sup> proceeds further to demonstrate the validity of yet a fourth way, that of the entrance of the man and woman under a canopy—*huppah*. Now this way—argues the Gemara—cannot be derived from *kese* alone by simple analogy, for it may be objected that *kese* has greater power than *huppah*, since it can be used for the purpose of redeeming consecrated things as well as the second tithe which, according to the rabbinic interpretation of Deut. xiv, 22-26, has a certain degree of sanctity. Similarly, *huppah* cannot be derived from *bi'ah* alone, since the latter has greater power in that it may serve for the purpose of acquisition in a levirate marriage. But, by taking *kese* and *bi'ah* in conjunction we can derive *huppah*.

*Bi'ah* by itself shows that the power of redeeming consecrated things and the second tithe is not the decisive factor in effecting a valid marriage, since *bi'ah* effects a valid marriage though it cannot be used for the purpose of redemption. *Kese* by itself shows that the power of acquisition in a levirate marriage is not the decisive factor since *kese* effects a valid marriage though it cannot be used for a levirate marriage. If, therefore, the specific feature of either *bi'ah* or *kese* fails to constitute the decisive factor in effecting a valid marriage, this factor must reside in some other feature which both *bi'ah* and *kese* have in common. The common feature is that both *kese* and *bi'ah* have the "power of acquisition elsewhere" (outside marriage). Now, since the deciding factor in effecting a valid marriage is due to the "power of acquisition elsewhere" and *huppah* possesses this power, *huppah* also effects a valid marriage. Thus, *huppah* is derived from *bi'ah* and *kese*.

This can be represented symbolically as follows: Let *A* represent the "power to acquire elsewhere," *B* the "power to redeem consecrated things and the second tithe," *C* the "power to acquire in levirate marriage," and *a* the power to acquire in ordinary marriage. Let the sign  $\longrightarrow$  mean "results in" and the sign  $\text{-----}$  mean "is the cause of." Then:

*Kese* *AB*  $\longrightarrow$  *a*

*Bi'ah* *AC*  $\longrightarrow$  *a*

Therefore *A*  $\text{-----}$  *a*

Hence *huppah*, which has only *A*,  $\longrightarrow$  *a*

The Gemara then proceeds to show, by using the method of elimination, that the decisive factor in effecting a valid marriage is, in fact, the common feature of possessing the "power to acquire elsewhere" and not any other feature which *bi'ah* and *kese* have also in common. The other common feature in *bi'ah* and *kese* is the "degree of pleasure" accompanying the performance of the

<sup>1</sup> Qidd. 5b.



act. The Gemara first assumes, by way of hypothesis, that it is this other common feature that constitutes the decisive factor in effecting a valid marriage. This, if the degree of pleasure is represented by *D*, would be symbolised thus:

*Kesef ABD* —————→ *a*

*Bi'ah ACD* —————→ *a*

Therefore *D* —————→ *a*

The hypothetical assumption is then eliminated in the Gemara by reference to *shetar*. *Huppah*—it is argued—cannot be derived from *shetar* alone for *shetar* may effect a divorce, but not *huppah*. *Shetar*, however, shows that the decisive factor is not the “degree of pleasure,” since there is no pleasure in the case of *shetar*. On the other hand, *kesef* and *bi'ah* show that the decisive factor is not the power to effect a divorce for they can effect a valid marriage without such power. Consequently, the deciding factor must be the one that *kesef*, *shetar*, and *bi'ah* have in common, namely, the “power to acquire elsewhere,” and this feature is shared by *huppah*, too. If *E* represents the power of effecting a divorce, we would have:

*Kesef ABD* —————→ *a*

*Bi'ah ACD* —————→ *a*

*Shetar AE* —————→ *a*

Therefore *A* —————→ *a*

Hence *huppah*, which has only *A* —————→ *a*

It will be seen from an examination of the above (and practically every example of *binyan 'abh* in the talmudic literature is developed on identical lines<sup>1</sup>) that we have here an exact analogy to what John Stuart Mill calls “The Method of Agreement.” He defines in the following way: “If two or more instances of the phenomenon under investigation have only one circumstance in common, the circumstance in which alone all the instances agree is the cause (or the effect) of the given phenomenon.”<sup>2</sup> Mill is careful to write “have only one circumstance in common” for if there are more than one there is no means of knowing which of them is the antecedent of the consequence. Thus in the example of the *binyan 'abh* given above, *huppah* cannot be derived from *kesef* and *bi'ah*

<sup>1</sup> Examples of the full employment of the method are to be found in Ber. 35a; Yeb. 77a; Qidd. 5b, 21a; Naz. 40a; B.q. 6a; B.M. 4a, 87b; San. 66a; Makk. 4b; Zeb. 5a, 5b, 11a, 16b; Men. 6a, 60b; Hull. 114a. These are given by I. BERLIN in his notes on the Talmud. SCHWARZ, *Induktion*, p. 61, n. 2, adds, further, Sabb. 28a and Qidd. 78a. There are also many examples of not fully developed *binyan 'abh* which imply the use of the method as described above. See, for example, Qidd. 5a and B.Q. 5b, and RASHI, s.v. וכולהו

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, loc. cit.; cf. L. S. STEBBING, *A Modern Introduction to Logic*, Lond., 1948, pp. 333-334.

for these have *two* factors in common, only one of which is possessed by *huppah*.

Mill gives as an example of the method: "Instances in which bodies assume a crystalline structure are found to have been preceded by instances which have in common only one antecedent, namely, the process of solidification from a fluid state. This antecedent, therefore, is the cause of the crystalline structure." Another example, given by A. Wolf,<sup>1</sup> is: "Brewster took impressions from a piece of mother-of-pearl in a cement of resin and beeswax, in balsam, in fusible metal, in lead, in gumarabic, in isinglass, etc. In all cases the same iridescent colour appeared. But the only character which these substances had in common was the form of the surface produced by the impression of the piece of mother-of-pearl. Hence that form of surface must be a condition of the iridescent colour."

The principle underlying the method of *binyan 'abh* as developed in the talmudic literature is the belief, very real to the Tannaim and the Amoraim, of the unity of the Torah, just as the principle behind the method of agreement is the belief in the unity of nature. To the rational mind it appears inconceivable that the different characteristics of the instances examined should result in the same effect rather than the characteristic they have in common. In the same way it appeared impossible to the rabbis that a principle found in a number of instances of the Torah laws should be attributed to diverse factors rather than to a common factor. In view of this the discussion of modern scholars as to whether the *binyan 'abh* is an exegetical or a logical principle<sup>2</sup> is apt to be misleading. In a sense it is both. It is exegetical because its application is based on the exegetical principle of the unity of the Torah, but given that premise its application is logical. It must further be borne in mind that in many, perhaps in most, cases of its application, the law derived was already known; the method being used not as a basis of derivation but as a means of "discovering" a support for the law in the Torah.<sup>3</sup>

Of course, the method of *binyan 'abh*, like the inductive method of agreement, is not infallible. There is always the possibility that a common factor has been overlooked. Generally speaking, as we have seen, the Talmud seeks to eliminate all factors but one in its attempt to establish the principle of causation. Sometimes, as will

<sup>1</sup> *Textbook of Logic*, Lond., 1930, pp. 217-218.

<sup>2</sup> V. C. HIRSCHENSOHN, *Berure ha-Middoth*, Jerusalem, 1939, pp. 184-185, and V. APTOWITZER in *M.G.W.J.*, 1911, pp. 185-189 (review of SCHWARZ's book).

<sup>3</sup> This is connected with the much-discussed question of whether the Midrash method was used before that of Mishnah or vice versa. For recent contributions to the elucidation of this problem, see JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, *Midrash and Mishnah in Rabbinic Essays*, Cincinnati, 1951, pp. 163-258, and H. ALBECK in the *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, N.Y., 1950 (Hebrew Section), pp. 1-8. At all events, it is certain that there are many *derashoth* which are later than the law they seek to support.

be seen from the following example, the common factor in the instances examined, which prevents the establishment of a general rule, is the very peculiarity of those instances.

Thus, the Talmud<sup>1</sup> seeks to prove that the negative injunction against cursing a parent is derived from the prohibition of cursing a prince, a judge, and a deaf man. The factor these instances have in common is that they are members of "thy people," a feature shared also by the parent. The retort to this argument is that the former three instances are all exceptional—the prince and the judge occupy a special position, and the deaf man stands alone in his affliction. There is, therefore, no evidence by which a prohibition against cursing a "normal" person (parent) can be derived from those instances.

There are, however, examples in the Gemara of an apparent rejection of the *binyan 'abh* inference. It is maintained in some cases that the instances examined, though they have no factor in common, have none the less separate characteristics not possessed by the new instance to be included under the general principle. At first glance this appears to question the validity of every *binyan 'abh*, but a proper understanding of the passages in question will convince us that this is not so.

The suggestion is made in the Gemara<sup>2</sup> that R. Judah (second century), who requires the penalty of flagellation for the transgression of a negative precept, even where no action is involved, derives this both from the case of the slander of a wife by her husband (Deut. xxii, 13-19) and from that of false witnesses (Deut. xix, 16-21). In each of these cases the penalty is flagellation even though no action is involved. From the case of slander by itself no inference could be drawn, because this case is distinguished by an unusual severity in that the husband has to pay a fine in addition to receiving flagellation. Also no inference could be drawn from the case of false witnesses by itself, for the witnesses are punished, unlike in other cases of transgression, without warning being given to them before the commission of the crime. But from both cases together it is possible to derive our law; for the case of the witnesses shows that the penalty of flogging is administered even where there is no fine, and the case of slander shows that this penalty is administered even where a prior warning is required. To this the Gemara retorts: "The common factor in the case of slander and in that of false witnesses is that they each possess a severity of some kind" (שִׁישׁ בָּרָם צַד חֲמוּר), i.e., in the case of slander there is a fine and in the case of the witnesses no prior warning is required. This retort is met by the statement that R. Judah denies that there is a *common* factor in these two cases. It would seem thus that we have here an attempt to challenge the

<sup>1</sup> San. 66a.

<sup>2</sup> Makk. 4b.



whole method of *binyan 'abh*; for if we accept the view that *different* characteristics are considered to be a common factor merely because the new instance has neither of them, what becomes of the general principle of *binyan 'abh*? This question is raised by the Tosafists,<sup>1</sup> but their solution is an artificial one.

One thing is clear. There can be no attempt here to challenge the general principle; for if this were so why is the challenge presented only here and nowhere else? On closer examination we can easily see why this case differs from others. For in this case there is no factor common to the instances examined and to the new instance that is to be derived from them. This is a case of simple analogy and here it may well be that the *different* characteristics are the cause of the law. In other words, the method of *binyan 'abh* is based on the idea that rather than assume that *different* characteristics are the cause of an effect, we must assume that a common factor is the cause. But for this to be assumed there must, of course, be a common factor.<sup>2</sup> Symbolically: let *F* represent the case of false witnesses, *S* the case of slander, *a* the characteristic of punishment without prior warning, *b* the additional punishment of a fine, and *x* the punishment of flagellation. Then the premises would be:

$$Fax \qquad Sbx.$$

It is obvious that from these premises no new case possessing neither *a* nor *b* can be derived; whereas in the usual case of *binyan 'abh* there is yet another factor shared by the premises and the new instance. Thus, if *N* stands for the new case and *c* for the factor common to all three, then:

$$\text{if } Facx \text{ and } Sbcx \text{ then } Ncx,$$

that is, if *Fac* is followed by *x* and *Sbc* is followed by *x*, then the cause of *x* must be *c*; therefore *Ncx*.

L. JACOBS.

Manchester.

<sup>1</sup> Makk. loc. cit. s.v. 'ela.

<sup>2</sup> This correct solution of the difficulty is given in the *Shitta Mequbbešet* of BESALEL ASHKENAZI to Keth. 32a.

# THE OLD PALESTINIAN RITUAL— NEW SOURCES

(Continued from Vol. IV, No. 1)

## III. DOXOLOGICAL PROLOGUE AND EPILOGUE TO THE FESTIVAL PSALM

The liturgical function of the biblical doxologies—especially those placed at the conclusion of each of the five books of the Psalter,<sup>1</sup> including the psalm-verse cxlvi, 10—and the extent of their use in the ancient service of the Synagogue in general, and in the Palestinian ritual in particular, requires an exhaustive investigation. Such an investigation, to be of any consequence, must be based on the manuscript material in the Cairo Geniza and, in addition, those rites which have now become extinct among the Jews must be taken into account. Only on the basis of the data recovered from the old sources will it be possible to explain the reason of the ultimate decline of scriptural doxologies in the Synagogue service. A recent study on *The Doxology in Synagogue and Church*<sup>2</sup> suffers from the failure to draw upon sources other than the Prayer-book of the Ashkenazi rite, which is in use to-day.<sup>3</sup>

It cannot, however, be our aim, in the compass of the present article, to give a comprehensive account of the whole subject. We have to limit our observations to the questions raised by the Geniza text published here.

1. Ps. xlvii in our fragment, the festival psalm for Rosh Hashshanah<sup>4</sup> is introduced by the doxological *berakha*<sup>5</sup> ברוך יי אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם ואמר כל העם אמן הללויה and concluded by the doxology<sup>6</sup> ימלך יי לעולם אלהיך ציון לדור ודור הללויה and the post-biblical *berakha* יהללך.<sup>7</sup>

The fact that the recital of a single psalm, in our case the festival psalm, is prefaced and closed by *berakhoth* is of significance. It is in contrast with the now generally accepted custom which requires introductory and concluding *berakhoth* solely for the groups of psalm: *Pesuke de-Zimra* and *Hallel*.

Our fragment is not an isolated witness. We meet the same liturgical phenomenon in another Geniza fragment preserved in

1 xli, 14; lxxii, 18-19; lxxxix, 53; cvi, 48; and Ps. cl.

2 By ERIC WERNER, *HUCA*, xix (1945-6), 275, ff.

3 Cf. note 4, p. 66.

4 See *Soferim*, xix, 2, ed. HIGGER, p. 322.

5 Ps. cvi, 48. Concerning the definition of "doxology" see E. WERNER, *op. cit.*, pp. 276-281.

6 Ps. cxlvi, 10.

7 Cf. *infra* p. 69ff.

Oxford, in connection with Psalm cxxxvi for the last day of Passover. Both texts are in complete agreement not only in having the same opening and closing doxologies, but also in regard to the wording of יהללוך. As will be noticed the text of the latter is given in MS. Oxford in an abbreviated form, *viz.*, indicating the words by one or more initial letters.

MS. Heb. g.2 (=Cat. no. 2700), fol. 22b

ולילה מקרא קודו אלאכיר יבתדי  
ברוך יי אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העול  
ואמר כל העם הללויה. הודו ליי כי  
טוב כי לעולם חם<sup>2</sup>  
[23a] הודו לאלהי האלהים כי לעולם חסד כוליה ימלך יי  
לעולם אלהיך ציון לדור ודור הללויה. יהללוך יי  
אלה כ מ ו ה יוד ויב את ש כ ל ל ו נ ל ל ו ז ו מ ו ע עו  
אתה בא יי מהולל התשבחות<sup>3</sup>

The two Geniza fragments in Cambridge and Oxford are so far the only examples of *biblical* doxologies for the epilogue and prologue to the festival psalm. Evidence for the usage of doxologies, biblical and non-biblical, for a single psalm is found in a text in the Geniza collection in Westminster College, Cambridge, Liturgica II/124, fol. 2a. This text, while agreeing with the previously cited fragments in using for the epilogue the *biblical* doxology *Yimlokh* (Ps. cxlvi, 10), disagrees with them in employing for the prologue the *post-biblical* doxology יי מלך יי מלך ועד<sup>4</sup>.

This is not the only variation in respect of the liturgical practice under consideration. Other sources unexploited hitherto reveal a still greater diversity. While the texts so far discussed agree, at least, in requiring doxologies both before *and* after the reading of the psalm, these other sources reflect two different customs, one requiring them as prologue only, the second as epilogue only.

<sup>1</sup> קדש, Translation: "On the evening of the last day of Passover commence."  
[Follows the text of the doxology and that of Ps. cxxxvi, 1.]

<sup>2</sup> "Then."

<sup>3</sup> See the full text *infra* p. 72ff.

<sup>4</sup> The rôle of this formula, composed of biblical phrases (Ps. x, 16; xcvi, 1; and Ex. xv, 18), was more than "to form merely a link in the chain figure of אֵין כְּמִידָה, or of אֵין כְּמִידָה, or of אֵין כְּמִידָה" (WERNER, *op cit.*, p. 314). It was accorded a prominent position as the prologue to the *Pesuge de-Zimra* in the rites of Byzantine, Italy, Kaffa, Aleppo, Spain, and Yemen. The importance attached to it is expressed in the rule that it should be said standing and repeated twice (in the Byzantine ritual three times). See *Mahzor Romania*, ed. Constantinople, 1574, p. 5b; *Mahzor Roma*, ed. LUZZATTO, i, p. 9a; *Kaffa Rite*, Mezyrow, 1793, p. 37a; *Manhig*, ed. Berlin, p. 10a; ABUDRAHAM, ed. Warsaw, p. 88; ASSAF, *Mi-Sifrut ha-Geonim*, p. 82; רמב"ם, Jerusalem, 1901, i, 14b. As conclusion to the *Ma'aribh* service, see ASSAF, *Dinaburg Jubilee Volume*, p. 125. I shall discuss this doxology in more detail elsewhere.



The former custom is found in a source emanating from North Africa: in an appendix to the Arabic *Siddur* by Solomon b. Nathan of Sijilmasa (composed in 1203), MS. Oxford, Catalogue no. 896,<sup>1</sup> fol. 227a-b. Here Psalm cxxi, which opens the *Ma'aribh* service at the termination of the Sabbath, is preceded by two biblical doxologies: Ps. xli, 14, and lxxii, 19,<sup>2</sup> and there is no concluding doxology.

A doxology only for the conclusion is found in (a) MS. Heb. e.41, in connection with Psalm cxxii for the Feast of Tabernacles<sup>3</sup>; (b) in T-S. H.8/14; and (c) in T-S. H.8/79, in both cases in connection with the New Year Psalm. All three texts use as epilogue the psalm-verse **יְמִלֹךְ ה'**

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the same epilogue was in vogue in the rite of Aleppo<sup>4</sup> in connection with all the festival psalms. This is the only rite in which we have been able to trace this ancient practice.<sup>5</sup>

Attention should further be drawn to the fact that the use of *Yimlokh* as doxological epilogue did not remain restricted to the recitation of psalms, but was extended to readings from the whole of the Hagiographa, of which the Psalter forms the most important part. This we learn from a Geniza text dealing with the different benedictions to be said before and after reading from the three parts of the Bible.<sup>6</sup> The psalm-verse *Yimlokh*, together with Ps. lxxxix, 53, and cvi, 48, is prescribed as conclusion after reading from the Hagiographa.

What is even more significant is that this use of *Yimlokh* was transferred also to the reading of the *Shema'* and its benedictions in the evening service. This is attested by a Geniza text published by Israel Lévi<sup>7</sup> in 1907, where the doxological verse in question is placed at the end of the *Ma'aribh* service, together with Ps. cvi, 48.<sup>8</sup>

Indeed, *Yimlokh* as epilogue to readings from parts of the Bible other than the Hagiographa has been preserved in the Sephardi

<sup>1</sup> NEUBAUER-COWLEY, i, pp. 190-1.

<sup>2</sup> For an introductory benediction of quite a different type see A. SCHEIBER, *The Rabbanite Prayer-Book quoted by Qirqisani*, HUCA, xxii, 1949, p. 316.

<sup>3</sup> See S. ASSAF, *Dinaburg Jubilee Volume*, p. 128, note 3.

<sup>4</sup> According to MS. Oxford, Cat. no. 1146 (identified by the present writer as *Siddur* of the Aleppo rite, see *Sa'adya Studies*, Manchester University Press, 1943, p. 272, note 2), p. 87a and 109b. Also in the very rare printed edition, Venice, 1527, p. 165a (in possession of S. SASSOON).

<sup>5</sup> None of the customs referred to above have been preserved in the rituals in vogue among the Jews to-day. However, in the Sephardi rite it is still customary to conclude the recitation of the daily psalm (שִׁיר שְׁלוֹמִים) with the doxologies Ps. cvi, 47-48, lxxii, 18-19, and the semi-doxology Ps. cxxxv, 21. The new sources disclosed in this paper throw a vivid light on this custom.

<sup>6</sup> Printed by J. ZIMMELS from T-S. H.18/9 (not 18/8) in *Rab Sa'adya Gaon*, ed. by J. L. FISCHMANN (MAIMON), Jerusalem, 1943, p. 550. Read in the second line **יְמִלֹךְ ה'** instead of **יְמִלֹךְ ה'**, in line 4: **יְמִלֹךְ ה'**, in line 5: **יְמִלֹךְ ה'**.

<sup>7</sup> REJ. liii, p. 235.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* note 1.



Gaon's *Siddur*,<sup>1</sup> on one hand, which has indeed one verse only, and with Byzantine, Italian, Kaffa, and Yemen rites on the other, where no more than two verses were customary.<sup>2</sup>

A different manifestation of this tendency is the joining together of two *post-biblical* doxologies. This we encounter in a Geniza text published by Professor S. Assaf.<sup>3</sup> Side by side with an enlarged version of יהללוך we have there, at the end of the *Pesuke de-Zimra*, a parallel composition beginning with the words תתהלל מלך.<sup>4</sup> This duplication is all the more striking as both compositions close with the same form of eulogy.

To sum up: We have noticed a tendency of joining together several doxologies. It expressed itself in three different kinds of combinations: (a) several biblical doxologies, (b) a combination of biblical and non-biblical doxologies, and, finally, (c) two non-biblical doxologies.

The recognition of this tendency and the manner of its manifestation will enable us to explain other related phenomena whose nature and purpose have hitherto been misunderstood.

#### IV. THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE DOXOLOGY יהללוך

The doxology יהללוך used in the Oxford and Cambridge fragments as epilogue to the recitation of the festival psalm is recited, according to all rites, after the reading of the *Hallel*. It belongs to the oldest constituents of Jewish liturgy. According to the Babylonian 'Amora R. Juda b. Yehezki'el (third century), it is identical<sup>5</sup> with ברכת השיר mentioned in the Mishna.<sup>6</sup> It is safe to assume that R. Juda, as the disciple of both Rab and Samuel, received this tradition from either of them.<sup>7</sup>

What was the original form of this doxology? It shares the fate of many other ancient prayers in Jewish liturgy which are referred to in talmudic sources only by their opening words, thus leaving us in the dark about the exact wording. The current versions and those found in medieval sources are of no help in

<sup>1</sup> P. 33, line 22. *Sa'adya* has the shortest of the doxological verses: ברוך " לעולם אמן ואמן (Ps. lxxix, 53). ELBOGEN's statement (*Gottesdienst, etc.*, p. 525) that the earliest source for these verses is 'Eleasar of Worms (1176-1238) has to be corrected.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to the verse mentioned in the preceding note, they have כולך " לעולם אמן ואמן, cf. *Maḥzor Romania*, 8a; *Kaffa*, 40a; *Maḥzor Roma*, 12a; *הבלאל* i, 23a.

<sup>3</sup> *Dinaburg Jubilee Volume*, p. 122.

<sup>4</sup> This composition was in use also in the Byzantine rite, cf. *Maḥzor Romania*, 20b.

<sup>5</sup> *T.B. Pes.* 118a. According to Samuel b. Meir (RSBM), R. Yoḥanan does not oppose R. Juda's view; he only supplements it by demanding both יהללוך and נשמה.

<sup>6</sup> *Pes.* x, 7.

<sup>7</sup> See JAWITZ, *Meqor ha-Berakoth*, 67.



this respect, since they display a wide range of variations and are obviously merely elaborations of one basic formula.<sup>1</sup>

This basic formula has been preserved both in our fragment (printed below) and in MS. Oxford, Heb. g.2. It immediately attracts our attention on account of its exceptional brevity. A comparison with other versions reveals that it is in fact the core of all the other texts, from which it can be recovered by stripping off the accretions. A juxtaposition of its text with that current in the Ashkenazi ritual, on one side, and with the version of Mahzor Vitry, on the other, demonstrates this very clearly :

Geniza :	Ashkenazi version : <sup>2</sup>
יהללוך יי אלהינו כל מעשיך	יהללוך יי אלהינו כל מעשיך (חסידים <sup>3</sup> צדיקים עושי רצונך. וכל עמך בית ישראל ברנה)
יוד' ויברכו	יודו ויברכו (וישבחו ויפארו וירוממו ויעריצו ויקדישו וימליכו)
את שמך	את שמך (מלכנו)
כי לך טוב להודות	כי לך טוב להודות
ונעים לשמך לזמרה	ולשמך נא אה לזמרה
ומעולם עד עולם אתה אל	כי מעולם עד עולם אתה אל
בא"י מהולל התשבחות	בא"י (מלך) מהולל בתשבחות

Mahzor Vitry, p. 298 :

יהללוך יי אלהינו כל  
מעשיך (חסידים צדיקים עושי רצונך ועמך בית ישראל ברנה)  
יודו ויברכו (וישבחו ויקדשו וירוממו ויפארו ויהללו)  
את שם (קדשך<sup>4</sup> יהוה ודורי יתנו לזכר מלכותך)  
כי לך טוב להודות  
ולשמך נעים לזמרה (בכל יום תמיד) כ י מעולם עד  
עולם אתה אל  
בא"י (מלך) מהולל בתשבחות

This juxtaposition speaks for itself. We need only call attention to the wording of the eulogy, which is especially noteworthy for two reasons. First, it is obvious that even the word מלך, which betrays no sign of being a later addition, was, nevertheless, not included in the original version. In this respect the evidence of our fragments is reinforced by the text published by Assaf, referred

<sup>1</sup> The least elaborate form is the one customary in the Italian ritual, see *Mahzor Roma*, ed. S. D. LUZZATTO, Livorno, i, 57b.

<sup>2</sup> S. BAER, *Seder 'Abodath Israel*, p. 114.

<sup>3</sup> The word חסידים is missing in our fragment. It is, however, found in MS. Heb. g. 2. We may assume that the omission is a scribal error, as the word in question is found in all versions.

<sup>4</sup> This order of the words agree with Maimonides' version in *Hilkh. Hanukah u-Megillah*, iii, 10.

<sup>5</sup> Also ABUDRAHAM, ed. Warsaw, p. 105, has this interpolation.

to above, where the word in question is likewise missing in both compositions. Secondly, the phrase *מהולל הזשבחות* is remarkable by reason of its syntactical construction. It clearly bears the stamp of authenticity; nobody would have changed the plain construction of the current version into the more difficult one of the fragments.

# V. THE TEXT OF MS. CAMBRIDGE, T-S. H.8/61

[ז]... להנחיליו אל למושעות. חג שבעה שבועות.

כז שבעה שבועות.2 ונא<sup>3</sup> פותיח בא יי הזן את הכל.

טוב שעמיה הצפונים. יקרה היא מפנינים.

כתב בלוחות משני פנים. לק[ול] ארבעים ותשע פנים.

מחנה מראש אמנה. ניתנה בברית ונורל ומנה.

סדורה מפי אל אמנה. עידות נאמנה.

ככת<sup>4</sup> עדות יי נאמנה מחכימת פתי ונא<sup>5</sup> ואכלת ושבעת זן

בא יי על הארץ ועל המזון

פיקודים ישרים. צדיקים מיושרים.

קראת היום למישרים. רעות נשואי על כנפי נשרים.

שמע קול להרשה. שבעה שבועות בלי להי...

תינה מעולם מחשה. תורה צוה לנו משה.

ככ<sup>6</sup> תורה צוה לנו משה ונא<sup>7</sup> בונה ירושלם יי בא בונה

ואזא אתפק אלפסח או אלענצרה לילה אלאחד רסם אלשאם פי  
פצל הטוב לך להודות<sup>8</sup> ידכרו אלהבדלה בקול כדי מנוח  
פי סידורהם. [זר] ע קודש הבדלתה מגוי נכר וברוב הבדלות<sup>9</sup> הבדלתם  
לשמך [וי]בדילו בין שומאה למהרה בין<sup>10</sup> פלג לרקיע שלג ארץ  
הקפית [וי]בדילו בין קודש לחול בין שבת קודש ליום מקרא קודש  
ימים יוצרו ולו אחד בהם<sup>11</sup> מה מאד נעמו פלאי ימינך על כן אודך על

1 On payyetic compositions of "Grace After Meals," see A. M. HABERMAN, *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem*, vol. v, 43ff.

2 Deu. xvi, 9.

3 Ps. cxlv, 16.

4 Ps. xix, 8.

5 Deu. viii, 10.

6 Deu. xxxiii, 4.

7 Ps. cxlvii, 2.

8 Palestinian form of the eulogy of the Thanksgiving Benediction; see ELBOGEN, *loc. cit.*, pp. 58, 518; FINKELSTEIN, *JQR*, xvi (1925), p. 165.

9 Cf. *Pesiqta*, ed. BUBER, Lyck, 1868, 46a; *Pesiqta R.*, ed. FRIEDMANN, Vienna, 1880, 69b.

10 Cf. *supra* p. 37.

11 Ps. cxxxix, 16. The verse is here quoted according to the tradition of the Western (Palestinian) Masoretes, who spelt לא and read לי whereas the Eastern (Babylonian) Masoretes, read and spelt לא. The very citation of this verse in the present context presupposes the Palestinian reading; it is, namely, to be rendered: "Days were fashioned and He has one among them"; the phrase "one among them" refers to the Sabbath, which is His day. Cf. *Pesiqta R.*, 115a: "ימים יוצרו ולא אחד בהם... שם"ה ימים הם ימות החמה, ליחידו של עולם אחד מהם, ואינו זו... רב. צדק אמר זה יום השבת" Cf. also *Tanhuma* (BUBER), *Bamidbar*, 20 (17); *Midrash Tehillim*, BUBER, p. 203, and *Elijah Rabba*, i, ed. FRIEDMANN, p. 4.

רוב פלאיך [כ] כו אודך על כי נוראות נפלאות<sup>2</sup> נפלאים מעשיך ונפשי  
יודעת מאד [ונא<sup>3</sup> טוב] להודות ליי ולזמר לש על בא יי הטוב.

יום תשעה באב יקול פי בית אלהי דויד

[רחם<sup>4</sup> יי אלהינו] ברחמך הרבים ובחסדיך הגדולים הנאמנים עלינו  
[ועל י]שראל עמך ועל ירוש עירך ועל ציון משכן כבודך ועל העיר  
[הא]בילה ההרוסה השומימה הנתו[נה ביד] זרים הרמוסה בכף עריצים  
[1b] ויבלעוה לגיונים ויחללוה עובדי פסילים כי באש החרבתה ובאש  
אתה עתיד לבנותה<sup>5</sup> ולנחמה כאמור<sup>6</sup> ואני אהיה לה נאם יי חומת אש  
לך ולכ א בת בא יי אלהי דויד בונה ירושלם ויזיד פי בית שומע  
תפילה. ענינו יי אלהינו ביום צום התענית הזה כי בצרה גדולה אנחנו  
אל תסתר פניך ממנו ואל תתעלם מלכינו מבקשתינו היה נא קרוב  
לשועינו שרם נקרא אתה תענינו כהבטחתנו על ידי נביאך<sup>8</sup> והיה שרם  
יקראו ואני אענה עוד הם מדברים ואני אשמע כי אתה עונה בכל עת  
צרה פודה ומציל בכל עת מצוקה כאמור<sup>9</sup> ויצעקו אל יי בצר להם  
ממצוקתיהם ויציאם כי אל שומע תפילה ותחנונים אתה בא יי שומע  
תפילה.

צלוה ראש השנה

ברוך יי אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם [ואמר כל ה]עם אמן  
הללויה. למנצח לבני קרח מזמור כל תקעו כף<sup>10</sup> . . .

ימלוך יי לעולם אלהיך ציון [לדור ודור]

הללויה. יהללוך יי אלהינו כל מעשיך יודו ויברכו את שמך כי  
[לך טוב] להודות ונעים לשמך לומר ומעולם עד עולם אתה אל בא יי  
מהולל[ת] התשבחות.<sup>11</sup>

1 Ps. cxxxix, 14.

2 Masoretic text: נפילתי

3 Ps. xcii, 2. The insertion of this verse before the eulogy is also found in MANN, *loc. cit.*, p. 309. Cf. the Aggadah about the origin of the Eighteen Benedictions in ISRAEL IBN AL-NAKAWA, *Menorat Ha-Ma'or*, ed. H. G. ENELSON, New York, 1930, ii, p. 164: . . . החליל לשבח ולי' . . . בשעה שברא ה' את אדם הראשון . . . מיד פתחו ואמרו בא"י הטוב . . .

4 With the text of this prayer the two versions found in *Yer. Ber.* iv, 3, 8a. *Tan.* ii, 2, 65c should be compared. Our version resembles more the one found in the latter place.

5 Both versions (see preceding note) in the current text of the Yerushalmi have only לבנותה. On the other hand, MS. Leiden has only לנחמה. Our text represents, thus, an amalgamation of various readings.

6 Zec. ii, 9.

7 This eulogy is a characteristic feature of the Palestinian version of the Eighteen Benedictions, see ELBOGEN, *loc. cit.*, p. 40.

8 Is. lxxv, 24.

9 Ps. cvii, 28. Cf. L. GINZBERG, *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud*, New York, 1941, iii, pp. 292-293.

10 Ps. xlvii. The MS. has the full text of the 'psalm.

11 Here follows in the MS. the *Ma'aribh* composition תהלים נבונים בתקעם בירה האיתנים. See I. DAVIDSON, *Thesaurus of Medieval Hebrew Poetry*, i, No. 5611, iv, p. 216. This *Ma'aribh* composition gained wide currency: it was used in Palestine and Egypt, as is evidenced by a number of fragments in the Geniza (in addition to our fragment it is also found, for example, in T-S. H.8/61 and T-S. H.2/14), in the old French ritual and its offshoots in the communities of Asti, Fossano, and Moncalvo (אסטי), in the English pre-Expulsion rite (D. KAUFMANN, *JQR*, iv, 1892, p. 40), and in the rites of Romania, Italy, and Corfu.



אתה בחרת ביש<sup>1</sup>

ותתן לנו באהבה מועדים לשמחה את יום מקרא קודש הזה את יום ראש השנה הזאת את יום זכרון הזה את יום תרועה הזאת לשמחה וליום טוב ולמקרא קודש ככת בת<sup>2</sup> וידבר יי אל משה לאמר דבר אל בני יש<sup>3</sup> בחדש השביעי באחד לחדש יהיה לכם שבתון זכרון תרועה מקרא קדש. וכל מלאכת עבודה לא תעשו והקרבתם אשה ליי. ונא<sup>4</sup> וביום שמחתכם ובמועדיכם ובראשי חדשיכם ותקעתם בחצצרות על עולותיכם ועל זבחי שלמיכם והיו לכם לזכרון לפני אלהיכם. אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו בל מל<sup>5</sup> מלוך עלינו ועל כל יש<sup>6</sup> כוליה אלי והשיאנו<sup>7</sup> יי אלהינו את ברכת מועדיך לשלום כאשר אמרת ורצית כן תברכנו סלה כי ביש עמך בחרת מכל העמים יום מקרא קודש הזה יום ראש השנה הזאת יום זכרון הזה יום תרועה הזאת באהבה ובשמחה הנ[חלתנו] בא יי מקדש יש<sup>8</sup> וראשי השנים ומחדש השנים וזכרון תרועה [ומז]עדי שמחה והזמנים ומקראי קדש. ואזא אתפק ראש [השנה]<sup>9</sup> יום סבת יקול מקדש [השבת]<sup>10</sup> וראשי השנים ומחדש השנים וזכרון תרועה ומוע[די שמחה והזמנים] ומקראי קדש.<sup>8</sup> קידוש בא יי . .

N. WIEDER

London.

Cf. D. S. BLONDHEIM, *REJ*, 83 (1927), p. 46. Further sources: D. S. SASSOON, *Descriptive Catal. of the Heb. a. Sam. MSS.*, i, p. 310 (*Mahzor Vitry*); p. 283 (*Mahzor Roma*) ii, p. 829 (א"ס); MS. Montefiore (now at Jews' College, London), Nos. 196 (Corfu), Fol. 1b-2a, 201 (Franco-German), Fol. 187a-b; and MS. British Museum, Or. 9150, 344a (cf. *Cat. of the Heb. and Sam. MSS. in the B.M.*, iv, p. 40).

<sup>1</sup> Beginning of the middle Benediction of the festival 'amidah, according to the ritual in the Holy Land, see ELBOGEN, *Die Tefilla fuer die Festtage*, in *MGWJ*, iv (1911), pp. 433, 435, 586; *Gottesdienst*, p. 134, No. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Lev. xxiii, 23-25.

<sup>3</sup> Num. x, 10.

<sup>4</sup> גלה מלכותך. Cf. *Sopherim*, xix, 7, ed. HIGGER, p. 327; ELBOGEN, *MGWJ*, *ibid.*, *passim*; *Gottesdienst*, p. 133.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A. MARMORSTEIN, *REJ*, lxxii, 84-100; A. APTOWITZER, *Mehqarim besaf Ruth ha-Ge'onim*, Jerusalem, 1941, pp. 75-76.

<sup>6</sup> In the MS., this word was omitted by error.

<sup>7</sup> Supplied by me; its omission in the MS. is a scribal error.

<sup>8</sup> For the eulogy see ELBOGEN, *MGWJ*, pp. 434-35; MANN, p. 329; ASSAF, *loc. cit.*, p. 128; MARMORSTEIN, *MGWJ*, 1925, p. 361.

## ‘OBADYAH, A NORMAN PROSELYTE

(APROPOS THE DISCOVERY OF A NEW FRAGMENT OF  
HIS “SCROLL”)

Following the publication, in Volume III, No. 4 of this Quarterly, of two letters from the Cairo Geniza referring to the conquest of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, I shall discuss here a number of other documents which come from the same source and relate to Palestine during the period of the Crusades. The first in time (and, if it had been more completely preserved, in importance also) is a fragment of the “‘Obadyah Scroll,” consisting of the remains of four pages contained in Ms. Taylor-Schechter 8.271 of the University Library, Cambridge. It is my pleasant duty to thank the Librarian for his kind permission to publish the manuscript.

In Elul (August-September) 1102, a Norman of noble descent embraced the Jewish faith. After many years of wanderings in Syria, Palestine, Egypt and, as we shall presently see, in Mesopotamia, also, he wrote the history of his conversion and of his search after the Jewish Messiah in the form of a Megillah or “Scroll”—a chronicle, three fragments of which have so far been published by various scholars. A comprehensive study of the material relating to this interesting personality and his “Scroll” was published by Jacob Mann in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, Vol. 89 (1930), pp. 245-259; and the same author dealt again with this subject briefly in his *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, Vol. II, p. 211 and Vol. II, p. 42.

Mann’s reading and interpretation of the texts can, however, by no means be regarded as final. A new edition, which would include facsimiles showing the interesting vocalisation omitted by Mann accompanied by a complete translation into a European language is most desirable. Its delay is justified only by the hope that additional fragments may still come to light,<sup>1</sup> for the parts known so far clearly constitute only a small fraction of the original Megillah. Thus, for example, the very date of the Norman’s conversion is known to us, not from the remains of his book but from his colophon (autograph) in a prayer book for the Sabbath night which was acquired by Mann in Cairo in 1924 and is now preserved in the library of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. The colophon reads as follows:

“‘Obadyah, the Proselyte, the Norman (*ha-normandus*; the word is vocalised) who entered the covenant of the God of Israel in the month of Elul in the year 1413 of the era of the documents,<sup>2</sup> which

<sup>1</sup> In particular there seem to exist good prospects that fragments may be found in such sections of the Cairo Geniza as have not yet been searched for this purpose, such as the sections of Hebrew Liturgy and Jewish Theology.

<sup>2</sup> The Seleucid era, beginning in 311 B.C. and widely used by Oriental Jews throughout the Middle Ages; it is still in vogue with the Yemenites.

corresponds to the year 4862 from the creation of the world; he, 'Obadyah, the Proselyte, has written this with his own hand."

About the antecedents of the proselyte we learn from a letter of recommendation issued on his behalf by R. Barukh b. Isaac of Aleppo, an important authority of his time. The letter was to be produced by 'Obadyah "in all the Jewish communities to which he may proceed."<sup>1</sup> The letter contains the following statement: "[The Jews<sup>2</sup>] who live in his country (in Hebrew: countries) have told us that this man comes from a great family and that his father was a great prince. This man is expert in the study of their books and, because he understood what he read in the books of their false doctrines, he returned to the God of Israel with all his heart and all his soul and all his might, and officially embraced Judaism before a Jewish court." Unfortunately, we do not know the proselyte's original name (see, however, below); for 'Obadyah, "the servant of God," is, of course, the name that was given to him when he was converted. This name was borne also by other converts, such as the famous 'Obadyah to whom Moses Maimonides two generations later addressed one of his admirable Responsa.

Neither do we know the place where the Norman took the decisive step of his life. Certainly not in Aleppo, as Mann surmises,<sup>3</sup> for Rabbi Barukh's letter repeatedly refers to 'Obadyah's conversion before *some* Jewish court, and to *some* Jewish scholars who had guided him. This, to my mind, precludes the possibility of his conversion in a place under Rabbi Barukh's jurisdiction. I also do not believe that 'Obadyah came as a Crusader to the East before 1102, as Mann assumes. From the tenor of Rabbi Barukh's letter of recommendation, from the fact that the Megillah describes 'Obadyah's personal experiences in the Jewish communities of the East between approximately 1113 and 1121 (see below), and from some evidence in the new fragment as well as in another manuscript obviously emanating from him (see below), it may be concluded that 'Obadyah embraced the Jewish faith while he was still in Europe and acquired there his knowledge of Hebrew and of the Jewish religion (cf. Barukh's letter, lines 54-61).

It may well be that his conversion was connected with the messianic upheaval among the Jews in France which, according to Maimonides' Epistle to Yemen,<sup>4</sup> occurred about that time. It would

<sup>1</sup> The text of the letter is preserved in the Bodleiana; cf. NEUBAUER-COWLEY, vol. II, No. 2873, 1. The Hebrew original of the passage was published by MANN, in *REJ*, 89 (1930), p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> Thus, approximately, the lacuna in the MS. should be supplemented, as rightly suggested by MANN.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 249.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. BOAZ COHEN's English translation in ABRAHAM S. HALKIN's new edition, New York, 1952, p. xx. All the details are doubtful. As the place of the event, "Linon, the capital of the country, with some tens of thousands [according to the Arabic original, p. 102, BOAZ has ten thousand] of Jewish families," is given, which scholars tentatively identify with Lyons. The chronology is even more vague, but seems to refer to the end of the eleventh century.



be worth while to discover whether 'Obadyah's Hebrew autograph colophon in the prayer book reveals a French or an Oriental hand, but even in the latter case he may have acquired this particular accomplishment years after he was converted to Judaism, or the colophon may represent only his first manner of writing Hebrew which he discarded afterwards.<sup>1</sup>

Because of his search after the Redeemer of Israel, and possibly also for reasons of safety, 'Obadyah was brought by Frankish Jews to the East, where he was introduced to the leading authority of Aleppo, Rabbi Barukh b. Isaac, who gave him the letter of recommendation to all Jewish communities already referred to—a letter urgently needed by 'Obadyah, who had not the means to maintain himself. This appears clearly from fr. I, l., 8; II, ll., 6, and 9, where it is stated that the Jewish communities of Aleppo, Damascus, and Dan (=Baniyas in Northern Palestine) supported him according to their means. Mann, it is true, infers from fr. II, ll., 1-2, that 'Obadyah was appointed by the Damascus community as a Gabbai, a collector of alms for the indigent, an honorary office usually conferred only on men of wealth. However, the text referred to says something quite different; namely, that the Damascus community appointed for 'Obadyah a special gabbai, who every week collected contributions for the benefit of the proselyte—a procedure which was quite common throughout the Jewish world in regard to needy foreigners of high social standing.

'Obadyah's poverty could be easily explained, if the fragmentary Ms. Taylor-Schechter 12.732, published by S. Assaf first in *Zion* Vol. V, pp. 118-9, and reprinted in his book *Texts and Studies in Jewish History*, Jerusalem, 1946, p. 149, actually belongs, as we believe it does, to the Norman proselyte. In this fragment from the Cairo Geniza, a Christian convert to Judaism states that he wrote fourteen tractates to prove the truth of the Jewish religion and handed them over to the highest dignitary of his Church; he copied out six of these tractates to serve as a basis for a disputation by means of which he hoped to convert his people to Judaism; instead, he was put into prison and threatened, if he did not repent with execution or banishment to a completely deserted island. However, influenced by a dream, the man in charge of the prison

<sup>1</sup> As far as I know no facsimile of this autograph has yet been published. As long as it has not been compared with the fragments of the Megillah, one cannot state with certainty whether 'Obadyah's Megillah was written by him personally. It can, however, be said that the two copies of the Megillah which must once have existed were written by the same hand (cf. facsimile No. 1 in E. N. ADLER'S *Catalogue*, Cambridge, 1921)—one copy vocalised, represented by fragments i, iii, and iv (preserved in the University Library, Cambridge, and to be discussed in this paper), and the other unvocalised and with few lines to the page (fragment i; in the ADLER collection of the Hebrew Theological Seminary of New York). It seems probable, as Dr. TEICHER has pointed out to me in a written communication, that the extant fragments of the "Scroll" are copies written by a professional scribe. The original was, however, written by 'Obadyah himself; cpr. notes 1 (p. 77), 4 (p. 79), and the Latin quotation on p.

let the convert escape. The latter, the fragment concludes, lost everything he possessed, but preferred to live on alms rather than return to his previous faith.

The fragment in question certainly does not belong to 'Obadyah's "Scroll" for there the proselyte always speaks about himself in the third person. But its contents are in complete conformity with Rabbi Barukh's statement that 'Obadyah changed his faith through the study of Christian theological books. The fragment no doubt formed part of a letter in which 'Obadyah explained how he, the scion of a noble family, came to live on charity.

It remains for us to discuss the chronological data that can be culled from the fragments of 'Obadyah's Megillah published so far. Fragment I, l. 4, refers to the death of Ridhwan,<sup>1</sup> the famous Seljuk ruler of Aleppo, which occurred on December 10, 1113; to the subsequent state of hardship in which the town found itself owing to the pressure of Roger, the mighty lord of Antioch; and finally to the installation in Aleppo of Ghazi b. Urtuq.<sup>2</sup> In Fragment II, we find 'Obadyah in Banias in Northern Palestine in the autumn of 1121. He states there: "To-day it is nineteen years since I entered the Covenant of the God of Israel." The fragment concludes by saying that 'Obadyah was proceeding to Tyre.

Concerning Fragment III some discussion is inevitable, as we are by no means able to follow Mann here, although his conclusions seem to have been accepted by contemporary Jewish historians. In the first line of the fragment, the prince al-Afdal is mentioned, while the subsequent details are introduced with the Biblical phrase "In those days." Al-Afdal, as Mann rightly assumes, is most probably the mighty Fatimid viceroy of Egypt, who was murdered in December, 1121, after having been in office since January, 1095. The fragment contains reports about two Messianic movements, the first of which is introduced, l. 3, by words which were read by Mann as follows: "In the mountains which are in the Land of Kazeriya." Mann remarks that the reading of the last word is doubtful—a warning which later authors unfortunately have ignored. "Kazeriya" was identified by Mann with the land of the Khazars (the Turkish people who adopted Judaism) and was supposed by him to refer to the province of Adherbaijan. Many conclusions have been drawn from the connection of the messianic movement described in Fragment III with the Khazars. However, the correct reading of the passage<sup>3</sup> in question is as follows: "In

<sup>1</sup> Cf. GROSSET, *Croisades*, vol. II, p. 482. ST. RUNCIMAN, *History of the Crusades*, Index to volume I. The MS. has *Radwan* (with a *daleth* and vowels), just as Fr. III, l. 1 has *al-Afdal* with a *daleth* and a stroke above it—indicating that the letter was pronounced as an aspirant. This would suggest that a European wrote those words, as Orientals very seldom transcribe Arabic *dhad* with a Hebrew *daleth*.

<sup>2</sup> GROSSET, *ib.*, p. 548.

<sup>3</sup> University Library Cambridge, Taylor-Schechter 10 K. 21 fol. i, l. 3. I read the passage with the aid of an ultra-violet lamp and had also the privilege of having the reading confirmed by Professor SOLOMON L. SKOSS, of Dropsie College, Philadelphia, a specialist in the deciphering of Geniza fragments.

the mountains of Ashshur (Assyria) in the country of Hakkēriya."<sup>1</sup>

Ashshur in medieval Hebrew designates the environment of Mosul<sup>2</sup>; while Hakkēriya is no other than the province occupied by the Kurdish tribe Hakkari and called after it Hakkāriya.<sup>3</sup> The main town of that province was 'Amādiya,<sup>4</sup> and it is with regard to this very town that we have in a contemporary Arabic source a detailed description of the activities of a pseudo-messiah which is in full accord with 'Obadyah's report. In an appendix to his "Ifhām al-Yahūd," a long pamphlet against Jews and Judaism, written between 1163 and 1174 by a convert to Islam, Samuel b. Yahya b. al-Maghribi,<sup>5</sup> the author relates how a Jew called Menahem b. Salomon Ibn Rūhī attempted in 'Amādiya to become the ruler of the town and invited the Jews of Adherbaijan and Persia to join and assist him. However, the plot was discovered in time and the leader executed. The Jews of Baghdad, who had the reputation of being the most clever of all Jews, believed in the usurper and expected to be flown to Jerusalem in a miraculous manner; they put on green robes and assembled on the roofs of their houses to await the miracle. As a result of this, the clever Jews of Baghdad became the laughing stock of the whole world. 'Obadyah tells almost exactly the same story, though he gives the name of the usurper as Ibn Dūgī. This is undoubtedly the correct reading, Ibn Abbas al-Maghribi's Ibn Rūhī being a misspelling easily to be explained by the deficiencies of the Arab script. 'Obadyah adds another important piece of information, namely,

<sup>1</sup> The last letter is *aleph* with a stroke above it, to indicate that it is *lenis*, i.e., not a consonant, but merely the bearer of the sound "a," or a so-called *mater lectionis*. In other cases the writer does not usually indicate the difference between the consonant and the *aleph* as *mater lectionis*, but cf., for example, *wehu'* 1.14 verso, *ba'qubah*, *ib.* 1.12 (stroke above *he*). In a foreign word he felt it necessary to be exact.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., for example, *Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, by M. N. ADLER, London, 1907, Hebrew text, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Encyclopedia of Islam* s.v. *Hakkari*. 'Obadyah must have heard the word pronounced with *imāla* and therefore correctly wrote *Hakkeriya*. Concerning the various spellings of the name in the Middle Ages cf. QUATRÉMERE, *Histoire des Mongols*, Paris, 1836, p. 328, note 125, to which Dr. AYALON kindly drew my attention.

<sup>4</sup> The town has retained its Hakkari population—in addition to a strong Jewish community—up to the present time; cf. *Enc. of Islam*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> The relevant passage was published—after a previous communication by S. MUNK—in its Arabic original and with a German translation by HAARBRUECKER in M. WIENER's edition of *Emek ha Bacha von R. Joseph haCohen*, Leipzig, 1858, Hebrew text pp. 22-24. The book as a whole was discussed in detail by M. SCHREINER in *MGWJ*, vol. 42 (1898), *passim*. A similar passage is found in an interpolation inserted in SHAHRASTANI's book of *Comparative Religion (Milla wa-Nihal*, composed in 1127), as well as in a manuscript of the *World History* of ABU'L FIDA (concluded 1329), from where DE SACY took it and printed it in his *Chrétomatie Arabe*, vol. I, p. 363, cf. *ib.* 360 sq. Finally, in 1939, the whole book was edited in Cairo (the passage under discussion is on pp. 60-63) from a faulty manuscript in a private collection (cf. p. 11 of the preface). The editor, who was mainly concerned with anti-Jewish propaganda, was not aware that the Royal Library of Cairo contains a manuscript of the interesting work. Thus, for example, the printed edition always has *al-'Amariya* for *al-Amādiya*, while the Cairo MS. is correct.



that a Jew from Jerusalem called Efrayim b. 'Azaryah Ibn Sahlun, who was fluent in Hebrew, composed circular letters, in the name of the pseudo-messiah, which were dispatched to all Jewish communities in that part of the world. The letters of the pseudo-messiah play a great rôle also in the other accounts of the events, but 'Obadyah's details concerning their author, as well as other features in his report (in particular, he does not seem to be aware of the leader's death), reveal that the events described occurred in his own time.

What is the date of Menaḥem b. Salomon Ibn Dūgī's messianic propaganda? Mann<sup>1</sup> boldly identifies him with the impostor David Alroy (made famous by Disraeli's novel) and places his activities in the years 1146-7. Although Mann was followed in this by some scholars, everything is against this identification. The two names are entirely different, and all the characteristic features in the accounts of the two pseudo-messiahs are different, too. Therefore, as long as no other evidence is available,<sup>2</sup> we have to assign Ibn Dūgī's activities approximately to the time referred to in 'Obadyah's fragments, that is, around 1113-1121. This tallies well with the fact that 'Obadyah describes in this fragment another messianic agitation, caused by one Ibn Shaddād<sup>3</sup> from Ba'qūbā<sup>4</sup> (a well-known locality near Baghdad), which resulted in the imprisonment of the latter and his followers. These two events may have been connected with the disturbances referred to in a circular sent from Baghdad to Egypt in 1121<sup>5</sup>: two persecutions, which were separated by a number of years, Jews from Baghdad having been thrown into prison on both occasions. The first persecution was obviously connected with the attempt made by certain Jews to discard the discriminating attire obligatory for non-Muslims, while the second was caused by a prophetess who announced the coming of the Jewish king. The refusal to wear the humiliating attire of a Dhimmi may, however, be connected with Messianic

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Hattequfah*, vol. XXIV, pp. 341-349, *REJ*, 89, 257-258.

<sup>2</sup> I have no doubt that the works of Muslim historians, either available in print or as yet in manuscripts to which I have no access at present, refer to the great ridicule of the Baghdad Jews. For SAMAW'AL AL-MAGHRIBI says that *up to his own time* the Baghdad Jews reckoned the years as from "the year of the flight." In passing, I should like to remark that SAMAW'AL's remark indicates that the events he described must have occurred a considerable time before he composed his pamphlet. The introductory words of the relevant passage, "Here is what occurred in our own time," are to be explained by the fact that, immediately before, SAMAW'AL talks about David and Joab and other biblical personalities.

<sup>3</sup> Not *Shadd*, as MANN has it. The word is clearly written שדר (vocalised: *Shaddad*), especially in the last line verso. This spelling too suggests a European scribe, for an Oriental would hardly have omitted *aleph* after the second letter.

<sup>4</sup> MANN reads *Bar'aquba*; but there is no *r* between *b* and *q*. It is characteristic that the MS. has *Ba'aqubah* for *Ba'quba* (for the silent "h" cf. n. 1, p. 78). To a European ear, 'Ayin is accompanied by an "a" sound, although it is consonantal in Arabic speech.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the present writer's *A Report on Messianic Troubles in Baghdad in 1102-21*, 1, in *JQR*, 1952, 57-76.

expectations, and, as we have heard, the Baghdad Jews were reported to have put on green robes for their flight to Jerusalem in the time of Menaḥem b. Salomon Ibn Dūgī—green being the colour of Paradise as well as of the Muslim prophet's family. In any case, there is no reason to assume a gap in the 'Obadyah "Scroll" of over twenty-five years between Fragments II (1121) and III (after 1146), as Mann does. On the contrary, it seems that the events referred to in fr. III only slightly preceded the date given in fr. II.

'Obadyah's familiarity with Mesopotamian affairs is to be explained by the fact that he had visited Baghdad, as we learn from the newly identified fragment, which I shall discuss now. The manuscript (T.-S. 8.271) is very badly damaged; the greater part of the pages is torn away and on a considerable portion of what remains the writing is partially or completely effaced. Nevertheless, the fragment enriches our knowledge of 'Obadyah in many respects. First, it appears clear that the "Scroll" was written in the form of a codex; for between lines 9-10 and 15-16 holes from the binding of the leaves are still visible. Owing to this detail, the sequence of the pages can be fixed with certainty:

Folio a, recto: first clearly discernible word, משנתו

Folio b, verso: first clearly discernible word, ישמעאלים

Folio c, verso: first clearly discernible word, אשר

Folio d, recto: first clearly discernible word (l. 10), מדינת

The most convenient point of departure for discussion of this Ms. is folio b, which clearly refers to the persecution of the Jews in Western Europe on the eve of the first Crusade. This reference is made in terms which are reminiscent of the "introduction" to the account of these events by Salomon bar Simeon and Eliezer bar Nathan (cf. A. Neubauer u. M. Stern, *Hebraeische Berichte ueber die Judenverfolgungen waehrend der Kreuzzuege*, Berlin 1892, pp. 1 and 36).<sup>1</sup> The two authors, who wrote about 1140, used for their Introduction one and the same source. This source had obviously been in 'Obadyah's hands also about thirty years earlier. The text of folio b can be restored approximately as follows:

Line 2: [get up and chastise the Isma]elites and the Jews,

3: [ . . . who do not believe in you]r God; for

4: [ . . . ] and to visit

5: [ . . . the Fr]anks and they did

6: [ . . . Chri]st whom they put on the cross

7: [ . . . and they] put crosses

8: [ . . . every one on] his cloth and on his shoulder

9: [But when they departed] to go to Jerusalem,

<sup>1</sup> On the evaluation of these sources see ST. RUNCIMAN, *History of the Crusades*, I, 134-141, 350.

- 10: [they said one to ano]ther: why should we  
 11: [go to a country far away to fight our en]emies, while  
       in our own countries  
 12: [and in our own cities there are] our enemies and  
       those who hate  
 13: [our religion. Why should we] leave them here with  
       our wives.  
 14: [This was the talk in all] the camps of the Franks.

The only detail not contained in the "Introduction" of the later accounts is the reference to the women, who should not be left alone with the Jews in the country while the Crusaders departed for Palestine.

On folio a, my attention was immediately drawn by two or three lines written in Hebrew characters but in a language which is neither Hebrew nor Aramaic nor Arabic nor Persian—the only languages to be expected in a twelfth-century Geniza fragment. Transcribed into Roman characters, the text reads as follows:

- Line 9: convertí(e)tur,<sup>1</sup> (y)winténebra<sup>2</sup> . . .  
 10: anti(e) kuwam véyinayt díyes du(o) . . .  
 11: . . . ls and in the language . . .

This, of course, is no other than the Vulgate text of Joel III, 4 (= Authorised version II, 31): [Sol] convertetur in tenebra[s et luna in sanguinem;] antequam veniat dies Do[mini magnus et horribi]lis.

This verse occurs in the fragment in a Hebrew context. The following is a translation of the remains of the text that are still visible:

- Line 1: [There awoke]  
 2: Yoh(á)nes<sup>3</sup> from his sleep and he was afraid . . .  
 3: he knew from words . . .  
 4: to them . . .  
 5: in that year . . .  
 6: the sixth from the . . .  
 7: As it is written [ . . . in the language of the . . . ]  
 8: Franks and in the language [of . . . Sol]  
 9: convertetur, etc. (as above).

I believe it is not too far-fetched to assume that in the "Introduction" to his "Scroll" 'Obadyah explained that his original name was John, and that he referred to himself in the account of his life before his conversion by this name, just as he always spoke

<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew sign for the stress, *metheg*, is rendered here by an accent. The readings *convertetur*, *ante* and *veniat* (line 10), seem certain.

<sup>2</sup> It might be interesting for the student of medieval Latin to inquire why the writer expressed the hiatus before "in" with a *waw* or a *yod* and not an *aleph* (glottal stop).

<sup>3</sup> The sign for the stress, but not for the vowel itself, is visible.



afterwards of himself in the third person as "Obadyah, the proselyte." He obviously had a dream which he interpreted in accordance with certain sayings current at his time relating to events that would happen that year in conformity with the terrible vision of the prophet Joel. As I learn from my colleague, Dr. Prawer, the verse of Joel was not uncommon in the propagandist literature of the First Crusade. The circumstance that it is quoted here, after more than twenty years, in the Latin version, although 'Obadyah' had acquired in the meantime a very good command of the Hebrew language, shows the tremendous influence it had had on him when he was first moved by its dramatic contents.

It is evident altogether that 'Obadyah's conversion was the outcome of a long process. Long before the event, which took place in the autumn of 1102, he had been stirred, like many others, by the portents preceding the First Crusade, but obviously he had been deeply moved also by the cruel persecution of the Jewish communities in Western Europe.

Between the folios a-b and c-d there is a gap of many years for in folio d we find 'Obadyah in Baghdad. This gap may well be filled by the fragments I-III published by Mann, although the sequence of 'Obadyah's travels is by no means certain. I give here a tentative translation of the remains of folio c, which describes events that must have occurred shortly before 'Obadyah's journey to Mesopotamia or on his way there:

- Line 2: which are not good<sup>1</sup> . . .  
 3: the man of God<sup>2</sup> . . .  
 4: he reposes on his b[ed, or grave] . . .  
 5: he stands up on his feet . . .  
 6: westward through their country . . .  
 7: looking like an emerald.<sup>3</sup> And fled on the way to  
     the We[st . . . ]  
 8: those who came from the East and pursued them  
     and . . .  
 9: the last one; and he turned to 'Obadyah the  
     Proselyte in horro[r . . . ]  
 10: very much on his head; and 'Obadyah [the  
     Proselyte] feared . . .  
 11: and 'Obadyah the Proselyte stored up in his mind to  
     keep . . .  
 12: and he had not known their interpretations until . . .  
 13: Moses the servant of God with God's writing . . .  
 14: from the beginning of the Thora to its end . . .  
 15: the . . .  
 16: the tribes of the Children of Israel . . .

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ezekiel xxxvi, 31.

<sup>2</sup> i.e., Moses, cf. Deuteronomy xxxiii, 1.

<sup>3</sup> *nofakh* (Exodus xxviii, 18), vocalised with "a" and not as usual with "e"

Clearly, the experience which 'Obadyah went through was somehow related to Moses. It is indeed to his apocalyptic interpretations<sup>1</sup> of the prophecy of Moses that the first legible line on folio d refers:

- Folio d, line 7: . . . and our interpretations of the prophecy of Moses . . .
- 8: And 'Obadyah the Proselyte went from the city of Mab(v)[s<sup>2</sup> . . . ]
- 9: [to Reh]ōvōth, which is on the river Euphrates; and he came . . .
- 10: . . . to the town 'Adīnah,<sup>3</sup> which is Baghdad . . .
- 11: [Isma]elites. And they came upon him . . .
- 12: and the gentiles wanted to ki[ll . . . ]and God . . .
- 13: . . . save him. And 'Obadyah the Proselyte came . . .
- 14: and he appointed for 'Obadyah [a Gabbai . . .]

No name of a town that might be expected here begins with "Mav."<sup>4</sup> We may suppose perhaps that 'Obadyah spelt Mawsil (Mosul) in accordance with some manner of western pronunciation (Mavsil), although Benjamin of Tuleda, who also came from a Romanesque country, correctly writes al-Mawsil. Benjamin took the same route as 'Obadyah, travelling in three days from Mosul to Rehōvōth, which in medieval Hebrew denotes ar-Raḥba, a flourishing town on the Euphrates, to-day Meyadin, south of the modern junction, Deir ez-Zōr. Raḥba harboured a considerable Jewish community.<sup>5</sup> It is therefore quite natural that 'Obadyah should have stopped there on his way to Baghdad. He may well have passed also through Ba'qūbā, the place of residence of the pseudo-messiah Shaddād, as well as Mosul, where he would have had an opportunity to make inquiries about Ibn Dūgī the Messiah from the not far distant Hakkāriya. In Baghdad itself he became the victim of Muslim fanaticism,<sup>6</sup> from which he was rescued—possibly by the Resh Galutha, the Exilarch and head of the Jewish community, who also appointed a "Gabbai" to look after him during his stay in the town, just as had been done earlier in Damascus.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hebrew *pithronoth*.

<sup>2</sup> It is not clear whether or not the *beth* has a *dagesh* (to be pronounced: "b" or "v"). The third letter is not complete and may be either "s" or "q."

<sup>3</sup> In medieval Hebrew, 'Adīnah ("Thou that are given to pleasures," Isaiah xlvii, 8—Old Babylon) denotes Baghdad. Such by-names were important for apocalyptic speculations; hence 'Obadyah does not fail to mention the Hebrew name, although he gives the usual name of the Abbasid capital as well.

<sup>4</sup> Neither Mambij nor Mopsuestia is possible here.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Benjamin's Itinerary*, ed. ADLER, Hebrew section, page 34.

<sup>6</sup> Under Muslim law no Christian may become a Jew or *vice versa*; the only change of religion allowed is to Islam. It would be hazardous, however, to attribute 'Obadyah's trouble to this injunction.

<sup>7</sup> See above, p. 76.

Finally, we may ask what induced 'Obadyah to compose his Megillah? First, we know that he was a prolific writer, since he composed fourteen tractates on the truth of the Jewish faith. Secondly, the appearance of the Norman in so many Jewish communities of the Muslim East<sup>1</sup> must have aroused general curiosity which he desired to satisfy. There may also have been considerations of a more materialistic nature. Copies of this Megillah—fragments of two have been found—may have been intended as gifts to wealthy patrons. It became a custom later on in all Jewish communities to disguise begging as the selling of books written by the applicant. However, 'Obadyah's Megillah clearly has a theological purpose: it seeks to demonstrate the character of the true Messiah. It is for this reason that he is interested in describing the false Jewish Messiah who appeared in his time. He also held a successful disputation in Banias with a Karaite (fr. II) who pretended to be the forerunner of the expected redeemer. This more serious character of 'Obadyah's Scroll is reflected in its style. While other known Megilloth—those of Ahima'az, 'Ebhyathar, and the "Egyptian" Megillah—indulge in a more consciously artistic or even artificial style, 'Obadyah uses a simple and dignified Hebrew. His style is similar to that of the Ashkenazic accounts of the Crusaders, which, as we have seen, served him as a model. Our intimate understanding of Christian and Jewish mental attitudes during the First Crusade would certainly be increased if a complete copy of 'Obadyah's Scroll were to make its appearance.

S. D. GOITEIN.

Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the seven communities referred to above (Aleppo, Damascus, Banias, Tyre, Mosul, Rahba, Baghdad) Cairo must also be mentioned, since the autograph and all the other documents relating to him were found there.



# NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

## 1. A REPLY TO A REVIEWER

In the *Journal of Jewish Studies* (Vol. iii, No. 3, 1952), under the headline "Current Literature," there appeared a review of the First Book of Maccabees, Dropsie College edition, translated by Sidney Tedesche and edited by the present writer. Since I am the Chief Editor, I assume responsibility for this translation. The reviewer disapproves of the translation and does not regard the entire work favourably. "There are a surprising number of peculiar translations," he says, "and too many downright mistranslations." He continues, "An example of the latter occurs in x, 58, where the Greek tells us that Ptolemy VI gave his daughter, Cleopatra, in marriage to Alexander Balas. In the Dropsie translation, Cleopatra becomes the daughter of Alexander and is given to Ptolemy." The text of the Dropsie edition reads as follows: "Ptolemy, with his daughter, Cleopatra, came up from Egypt, and arrived at Ptolemais in the one hundred and sixty-second year. King Alexander met him, and bestowed upon him Cleopatra his daughter, and celebrated her wedding in Ptolemais as kings do, with great pomp." Of course Cleopatra was the daughter of Ptolemy, and the omission of the pronoun "he" before "bestowed," as referring to Ptolemy, would not mislead any intelligent reader.

In finding fault with the translation, the reviewer writes, "In vi, 56, the addition of 'with him,' which is not in the Greek, produces the erroneous statement that the regent Philip had returned from Persia with the young Eupator; in fact, as the next verse shows, the young king was with Lysias besieging Jerusalem." The text of the Dropsie edition is as follows: "When Lysias heard that Philip—whom King Antiochus before his death, had appointed to rear his son Antiochus as king—had returned with him from Persia and Media with the armies that had accompanied the king, he hastily returned." The phrase "with him" does not refer to the boy king, but to the body of Antiochus IV which Philip brought with him. Probably the words "with it" would be more appropriate.

The Second Book of Maccabees, ix, 29, says explicitly that "Philip brought his body home." Charles rendered this text, "and Lysias heard that Philip whom Antiochus the king—while he was yet alive—appointed to nourish up his son Antiochus that he might be king, had returned from Persia and Media, and with him the forces advanced with the king." Depending upon the Second Book of Maccabees, and giving credence to the view that Philip in order to strengthen his hold on the kingdom carried with him the corpse of Antiochus IV, I took the phrase "with him" to mean the corpse of Antiochus.

The reviewer also objects to the footnotes which were supplied by the present writer. "Sometimes the footnotes," he says, "instead of throwing light on the meaning of the text, simply serve to obscure it. Thus in ix, 11, the translation runs: 'The army set out from the camp . . . with the cavalry divided into two parts. The slingers and the archers marched in the vanguard of the army with all the first line shock-troops, while Bacchides was on the right wing.' This is a straightforward enough description of the Syrian army's disposition. But the footnote makes nonsense of the passage by stating that 'the army' in question is that of Judah. This note only requires an impossible change of subject in the middle of the verse, but also commits the anachronism of attributing cavalry to the Maccabean forces in the first year of the revolt."

The footnote does not, as the reviewer contends, obscure the text, but clarifies it. He has misconstrued the passage because he has quoted only a part of the footnote. Text ix, 9-11, states that when Demetrius sent Bacchides and Alcimus to Judaea to fight Judah, his men tried to dissuade Judah by saying there was no chance of victory (winning the battle). Judah said, "Far be it from me that I should do such a thing as to flee from them." Then the text relates that "the army," that is the army of Judah, "set out from the camp and stood in battle line against them (i.e., against Bacchides and Alcimus) with the cavalry divided into two parts." The cavalry does not refer to the army of Judah, but to Bacchides and Alcimus. This is well supported by the Latin manuscript "B": *Et promovit exercitus Judae et exivit de castris, et steterunt contra exercitum Bacchides et Alchimi*. If the reviewer had not misconstrued this footnote, he would not have been critical of my footnote.

In regard to text x, 71, Osterley has, "Let us try conclusions with one another." Featherweather and Black have, "Let us try the matter together." Grimm has, *Wir wollen uns einander messen*. The Dropsie edition has, "Let us contend with each other," based on Josephus where he has, "You shall have a contest with us." Most likely the original Hebrew had, לכה ונתראה פנים

The reviewer has objected strenuously to my statement on page 59, in reference to the verse iii, 41, that "the land of *Allophulon* meant the land of the Philistines." I made this identification here to show that since Jossipon used the word "Philistines" he made use of the original Hebrew Maccabees, because the word "Philistine" occurs neither in the Greek nor in the Latin versions of the First Book of Maccabees; and it does not appear in Josephus. The Greek has *Allophulon* instead of Philistine. Similarly, in the Septuagint (except the Pentateuch and Joshua) *Allophulon* stands for Philistine. I never said that the term *Allophulon* in the first Book of Maccabees always stands for Philistine. Relying upon geographical evidence and upon Jossipon, I said that in this particular passage *Allophulon* stood for Philistines.

The reviewer finds fault with me because in one place I said, "Ralf's text is quite arbitrary and was chosen because it was superior to other editions." He found that I said, on another page, "The best or most modern edition is that of W. Kabbler." He asks why we did not use Kabbler's edition if that is the best. The reason is twofold. While Ralf's text is quite arbitrary, it was used because it was the best of all previous editions, and particularly because it contains almost all the apocryphal literature which we intended to publish, while Kabbler, so far, has only the First Book of Maccabees, and the superiority of his text is due only to the apparatus.

The reviewer now takes up my arguments on the dating of the book. In my opinion, the first thirteen chapters were written by one author, while chapters xiv-xvi inclusive were written by another and were added after the destruction of the Temple. The reviewer does not agree with me; he says that Ettelson has shown the integrity of the First Book of Maccabees. Ettelson may have convinced the reviewer, but he has not convinced me. I showed, from internal evidence, that the last three chapters were not written by the same author as the first thirteen. I pointed out the different terminology used in these two parts which the reviewer quoted but misunderstood; I noted that the author used the term "prophet" in chapters iv and ix, but that in chapter xiv the text was "A true prophet." How does he explain this difference? This was one of my proofs that chapter xiv was written at a later date. The reviewer said that my argument "is wholly insufficient to form the basis of a theory which conflicts with all other evidence." What evidence is there? Why did he not produce it? Unless he can produce evidence to the contrary my theory stands firm.

Furthermore, Josephus, in his account of the Hasmoneans follows the First Book of Maccabees up to chapter xiv, while in relating the History of Simon he is very brief and does not use chapters xiv-xvi, because they were not yet a part of the original First Book of Maccabees.

The reviewer objects to my theory that the First Book of Maccabees was re-edited after the destruction of the Temple. "Is it conceivable," he asks, "that, with Jerusalem razed to the ground and the Temple Tax forcibly converted to the use of Jupiter Capitolinus, even the most ardent Pharasaic quietist would have re-edited the eulogy of the Romans in I Maccabees?" Yes, some of the sages, who represented most of the Jewish people, sought a *modus vivendi* with the Romans. One of the great sages praised the Romans highly. Rabbi Joshua also tried earnestly to live in peace with the Romans. The sages placed the entire misfortune of the Jews on the extremist *Sicarii*, whom they called robbers, and many Jewish leaders who sought a *rapprochement* with the Roman Empire could have re-edited the First Book of Maccabees. I dealt



with many of the problems of this period in my essay, "The Assumption of Moses and the Revolt of Bar Kokhba."

The reviewer takes up the question of the Seleucid chronology. He says, "Dr. Zeitlin takes his stand upon the evidence of the Second Book of Maccabees." From my book, *Megillat Taanit as a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, it is clear that my stand was not only upon the evidence of the Second Book of Maccabees, but particularly upon that of the First Book of Maccabees and the works of Josephus. His statement, "no discussion at all of its basic assumption," shows not only that he is unfamiliar with my book, *Megillat Taanit*, but that he has no knowledge of the chronology of the First Book of Maccabees.

Niese's contention of the historical value of the Second Book of Maccabees, the reviewer says, "has been decisively destroyed by Laqueur, Kolbe, and Tschirikower." Niese's point of view is far from being destroyed. Only one, who himself is incapable of destroying Niese's view, and who must blindly follow what other scholars have written, can make such a statement. And is it not somewhat presumptuous to state, without proof, the following? "The numerous errors which follow from the false [*sic*] assumption that 'the chronology of the First Book of Maccabees is one year later than the Second Book of Maccabees' and from the subsequent attempt 'reconcile' them cannot all be examined in this review."

Why did the reviewer not point out and correct these errors? I suspect he is not well versed in the subject; these errors are imaginary; my theory on the chronology of the First Book of Maccabees is unassailable. The reviewer states, with reference to iv, 52, that all the uncials give Kislev 148 A.S. as the date of redemption. This is not true; at least one manuscript has 147. So has 148, which is the correct reading based on internal evidence of the chronology and chronography of the First Book of Maccabees. Furthermore, this date is substantiated by the cycles of the sabbatical year, in spite of the reviewer's assertion that the sabbatical cycle is "doubtful evidence."

If the reviewer had made a study of the sabbatical cycles given in rabbinic literature, he would have known otherwise. Such an assertion is not surprising coming from one who is unfamiliar with the subject. Compare also my note iv, 54.

The reviewer further makes the charge that, "Other unsubstantiated chronological assertions are made by Dr. Zeitlin. Thus he states that the official Seleucid era 'began in May, 312, when Seleucus defeated Demetrius near Gaza.' Not only does this conflict with the general opinion of scholars who, however divided on other points, agree in fixing the starting point at October, 312 B.C.E. . . There are no conflicting opinions among scholars about the origin of the Seleucid era. Its origin dates from the victory of Seleucus

and Ptolemy over Demetrius at Gaza, in May, 312 B.C.E. However, in some localities where the year started in the autumn, in October, on adopting the Seleucid era, they adjusted their method of reckoning to their method of counting the years, i.e., they began the Seleucid era not from May, 312 B.C.E., but October, 312. The interval between May and October was disregarded. In the localities where the year began with the spring, in adopting the Seleucid era, they adjusted it to their counting of the years, i.e., from the spring of 312. I have advanced the theory that when the calendar of the Seleucid era was adopted in Judaea, the Jews moulded it in accordance with their reckoning of the calendar. They began to count the Seleucid era from the autumn of 313, because according to the Jewish conception part of a year was counted as a full year. Therefore, the period from May, 312 to the autumn of 312, i.e., Tishri, was counted as a full year. One could not expect the reviewer to know this complicated chronological system of reckoning.

I have also advanced the theory that the kings of the Seleucid dynasty counted their era from the time of the victory at Gaza, which made possible the establishment of the dynasty, and that they disregarded the traditional New Year which came in the autumn. I have been able to substantiate this theory from their coins. The reviewer says, "It also defies all logic, by postulating that a Macedonian general should choose to start his official era in the middle of the Macedonian year." This appeal to logic is not sustained. The Seleucid kings did not choose the date, the date was chosen for them. The victory at Gaza was the starting point of their might. It was more than logical that the kings should start reckoning the years from that momentous victory. This practice was common in the ancient as well as in the modern world. Has the reviewer not heard that in the United States of America the era of American independence begins with the Fourth of July (in the middle of the year), because independence was declared on that date, and that in part documents are thus dated?

I regret the few misprints which the reviewer found and a few others which crept into the book. It is unfortunate that no book is exempt from errors. In his own review there are misprints. To mention one—he quotes the following passage from page 66, "the best or most modern edition is that of W. Kappler." The text of the book has, "the best *and* most modern." Regarding the footnote to x, 21, see my book *Megillat Taanit*, etc., pp. 12-13, n. 27.

The reviewer sometimes achieves a remarkable degree of misconstruction, as in the following passage: "p. 260 contained the surprising information that Lysias 'assumed the crown of Antiochus Eupator.'" The text reads: "assumed the crown *as* Antiochus Eupator." This, I believe, is not a misprint; the reviewer has twisted my statement. My statement, "assumed the crown *as* Antiochus Eupator," does not refer to Lysias, but to the boy, the



son of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was with Lysias in Syria. When the news of his death reached Lysias "he (the boy) assumed the crown as Antiochus Eupator."

The reviewer adds the following statement with reference to the previous passage: "Or perhaps this later incident is not a misprint. This remark, perhaps, may be turned upon the reviewer himself. He twisted my statement, "assumed the crown as Antiochus Eupator," to read, "assumed the crown of Antiochus Eupator." He adds that this misconstrued assumption on my part "is hardly more surprising than the statement in the Introduction (p. 14) that the sons of Tobias 'were priests and descendants of Simon I.'" The sons of Tobias in point of fact were priests and also descendants of Simon I, as I have shown in my book, *The Second Jewish Commonwealth Prologomena*. The sons of Tobias were priests and were descendants of Simon I on their maternal side.

The reviewer was so absorbed in his search for imaginary errors that he has resorted to misconstruing the text and taking out sentences from it to justify his charge that the book contains "downright mistranslations." The Greek text was not mistranslated. The translation was acclaimed by many reviewers. Professor R. H. Pfeiffer, of Harvard University, wrote as follows: (*Croze Quarterly*) "The translation has admirable qualities: it is accurate without being literal, dignified without being archaic." In many instances, however, the translation could not be in consonance with the Greek text because the Greek text is faulty. I was certain the Greek translator had misunderstood the original Hebrew, and hence this had to be reconstructed. In each case where the translation does not correspond to the Greek text, the reason for it is given in the commentary. If one may judge the reviewer by his article, the conclusion would be that his knowledge of Hebrew and the historical background of I Maccabees is very meagre.

The reviewer, in the beginning of the so-called "review," criticises the editors of the volume for ignoring previous editions by Charles and Kautzsch. These two editions are mentioned on page 66. Further comments are unnecessary.

SOLOMON ZEITLIN.

Dropsie College.

## 2. ABU NADDARA, AN EGYPTIAN JEWISH NATIONALIST

In his essay on "Abu Naddara, an Egyptian Jewish Nationalist" published in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* (Vol. iii, No. 1, 1952) Jacob M. Landau, on pp. 40-43, in dealing with Abu Naddara's attitude towards the French and the English respectively, omits to note an important allusion to the reaction of the Egyptian Jewish nationalist to a particular clash between the two latter Powers when Marchand, the French commandant, was defeated in his specific



object of extending French influence on the Nile as a consequence of Kitchener's historic appearance at Fashoda in mid-1898. It is known that had Marchand succeeded in his purpose, it would, in all likelihood, have resulted in war between the French and the English, for the latter would then under no circumstances have admitted any foreign claim to the Nile Valley.

That Abu Naḍḍara, who is also otherwise known as James Sanua, was aware of this special conflict between the French and the English is a fact recorded thus by Wilfred Scawen Blunt in his *My Diaries (1888-1914)*, London, 1932, p. 305 :

"28th October (1898)—To Paris on my way home. Called on Abu Naḍḍara, who gave me some details of the Marchand mission. Marchand had come to him three years ago to ask his advice about penetrating to the Upper Nile, and how to make friends with the Khalifa, and he (Sanua) had given him papers inscribed with texts from the Koran, and as I understood him, introductions from one or two persons at Omdurman. Marchand's idea was to go and make friends with the Mahdists and help them against England. He was certainly sent by the French Government. Sanua is severe on the stupidity of French diplomacy and considers France very low down in the scale of European nations. He told me a good deal about his visit to the Sultan Abdul Hamid, who had received him with all honour, and allowed him to speak only frankly and openly about affairs. He says the Sultan is acquiring an immense prestige from the Emperor Wilhelm's visit, which is everywhere in the East regarded as an act of homage."

S. A. ROCHLIN.

Johannesburg, South Africa.

### 3. CORRECTIONS TO *JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES*, VOL. III, No. 4

Professor S. D. Goitein has sent in the following corrections to his paper "Contemporary Letters on the Capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders":

Document No. 1 (pp. 171f.), line 1: read "who gave us the opportunity to call for the fulfilment of this pious deed," instead of "who gave us the opportunity in fulfilling . . ." Line 3: read "sent," instead of "spent." Line 17: read "But he could not ransom some of the people and leave the others" instead of "But he could only ransom some of the people and had to leave the others." Line 42: read "potions (medicaments taken in wine, etc.)" instead of "water and other drinks."

Document No. 2 (p. 176), lines 34-35: read "If, however, God forbid, this time (35) is like the previous one (*i.e.*, if there is again no possibility of making the pilgrimage to Jerusalem)," instead of "My Salvation is in God, for this (35) [is unlike] the other previous occasions [for making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem]."

## CURRENT LITERATURE

A. AKAVIA and S. R. GOLDBERG,  
מלון למנוחי צבא (Dictionary  
of Military Terms, English-  
Hebrew). xii, 418; Haifa, 1951.

The Scroll of "The Wars of the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness" is our only evidence that even in post-biblical times there existed a Hebrew military vocabulary, dating perhaps from the Maccabean wars. Neither biblical nor talmudic writings are much concerned with organised warfare, and the Israel Defence Army, as well as its predecessor, the Haganah, had to create its technical terms with little help from the past. Its terminology, like its organisation, largely mirrors that of the British Army. In actual army parlance, English terms are common, and invade even non-technical vocabulary, as in the phrase I heard from an officer: **אצלנו כל אחד דואג ליונה שלו** (I leave the reader to puzzle that one out). It speaks for the earnestness of the army leaders that they have spared no effort to create and enforce an official Hebrew terminology. This is all the more important as the army is for the bulk of new immigrants also their introduction to Hebrew, and habits acquired here will determine the linguistic character of civilian life.

The dictionary, which represents the terms approved by the permanent army language committee, contains close on 5,000 items. In the nature of things many of them concern topography, traffic, etc., and will be found useful in application to civilian life; others contain elements of composition and formation which allow of general application. Inevitably, the army has in some cases arrived at results which conflict with those of the Language Academy and other language-creating bodies. This

seems to be all to the good, even if it concerns such controversial inventions as **ודא** "to confirm" (from **ודאי**), which in many forms sounds like the corresponding form of **בדה** "to invent lies." The items are listed in the order of their English (or American) equivalents, and for the most part Hebrew explanations are given as well. It seems to the reviewer that in this way some of the characteristic Israeli terms have come to be omitted, such as **משלט** "high observation post" nor will the avid reader of stories about the War of Independence find here any explanation of *Davidkah*, *Machalnik*, and the like. In exchange we get the Hebrew equivalents for "quiver" and "battering ram," no doubt in the interest of the student of military history.

To the student of Hebrew special interest lies in the "revivals" of ancient words in new meanings. This dictionary contains many of them, and the conservative reader will be in for some shocks on discovering that **השכמה** is "veille" and **ממש** a "batman" (the biblical **שש** is also offered). Antiquarians will be interested to know that the talmudic **כומתה** (skull-cap) has become a "beret" and **דנרה** (Latin *funda*, "money belt") "bandolier." Some of the terms breathe a fine biblical spirit, e.g. **ימי תותח** "life" of a gun, which remind one of passages such as Psalm lxi, 7. As against this, there are terms whose alien character seems to have escaped the compilers: thus **טבילת אש** does not contain any of the associations of "baptism of fire," which slavishly translates.

Well printed and handy, this is a welcome addition to Hebrew lexicography.

Oxford.

C. RABIN.